

## Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

---

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

---

2003

# Faculty Senate Minutes-2003

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "Faculty Senate Minutes-2003" (2003). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 10.  
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/10>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu).

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**Russell Union Ballroom**  
**February 12, 2003**

**Senators (or Alternates) in Attendance:** Martha Abell, David Allen, Sharon Barrs, John Brown, Constance Campbell, Ruth Carroll Diana Cone, Carol Cornwell, Marc Cyr, Phyllis Dallas, Gary Dartt, Cordelia Douzenis, (Susan Trimble for Elizabeth Downs), David Dudley, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, (Debbie Evans for Susie Lanier), Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Chris Geyerman, (Barry Balleck for Mary Hadley), Alice Hall, (Wendy Chambers for Steve Jenkins), John Kim (SGA), Clara Krug, Bill Levernier, Jim LoBue, Karl Manrodt, Karen McCurdy, Mary Marwitz, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Sandra Peacock, Ann Pratt, Jeanette Rice (Norman Schmidt substituted for Jeanette Rice after 5:00), Debra Skinner, Jim Stephens, (Carol Nessmith for David Stone), Deborah Thomas, Jerry Wilson.

**Senators Absent:** Jonathan Perkins, Stuart Tedders, Matthew Williamson

**Administrative Members in Attendance:** Bruce Grube, Linda Bleicken, Marilyn Bruce, Ron Core, Jeff McLellan, Vaughn Vandegrift

**Visitors:** Charles Skewis, Bede Mitchell, Fred Whitt, Charlie Hardy, Bob Haney, Johannes Reichgelt, Shari Park-Gates, Denise Battles, Candace Griffith

---

**1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 12, 2003, Meeting: David Allen, Senate Moderator**

Allen (CLASS) moved to amend the agenda, adding to it election of the Chair of the SEC and moving apportionment issues to earlier on the agenda. Seconded and approved.

**2. Approval of the November 25, 2002, Minutes: Marc Cyr, Senate Secretary**

Cyr (CLASS) noted two typos in the November 25<sup>th</sup> minutes, Item 5: the end of line 1 beginning of line 2, should read “one was re: election proceedings,” so cut out “from the college of”; and in the third line of #5, the word “to” should be between the words “directed” and “consult.” He then moved approval; seconded and approved.

**3. Librarian’s Report for February 12, 2003 (February 5, 2003) Senate Meeting: Richard Flynn, Senate Librarian**

Flynn (CLASS) moved approval of the February 5<sup>th</sup> Librarians Report; seconded. Clara Krug (CLASS) noted that while Senators are specifically reminded that the Librarian’s report is available, faculty-at-large are not, and she wanted this meeting’s minutes to inform them that on page 2 of that report it is noted that the Faculty Welfare Committee decided that there was no need to include in the Faculty Handbook the statement which the Senate had drafted at its

October meeting – to wit, “departmental criteria (as opposed to University criteria) under which one is hired will remain in effect until at least the first personnel action (tenure or promotion)”-- given the vagueness of the term “departmental criteria.”

**a. Undergraduate Committee Minutes: Report from Undergraduate Committee: Constance Campbell (COBA), Co-Chair**

Campbell had nothing to add to the already approved report.

**b. Graduate Committee Minutes: Report from Graduate Committee: Jerry Wilson (COBA), Chair**

Re: the Faculty Development fund disbursement issue, a proposal was submitted to the committee by Dr. Hardy, but it was an extensive meeting so it was tabled to be discussed at the next meeting; resolution of that issue is expected at the February 19 meeting. [SECRETARY’S NOTE: That issue is now moot; see the Provost’s budget remarks below, on page 4.] Also talked about briefly was the graduate faculty selection process. The subcommittee that looks at the applications submitted each term for graduate faculty status is already charged with readdressing the application process to decide if any changes should be made and making recommendations to the Senate.

**4. President’s Report: President Bruce Grube**

President Grube noted that the University System has experienced a cut of about 11%; Georgia Southern has lost close to \$7 million from its budget. We are in a tough situation, but not nearly as dire as some other states, such as California, which is looking at 10% added to previous cuts and 20-25% tuition hikes. One bright spot is that after 15-16 months of declining revenue, Georgia has just had two months of increased revenues, so perhaps we’ve bottomed out and are on the way back up.

He said that up to this point, the University administration has been fairly successful at handling cuts such that most people on campus haven’t felt them, but that buffering is no longer possible. In order to avoid layoffs of faculty and staff, which is the priority, many things are being pinched; faculty, staff, and administrators will have more work and fewer resources for a while before the budget picks up again. This does mean more students per class particularly because hard economic times bring increased enrollments just when budgets decrease. The administration is talking long and loud to every legislator they can. President Grube knows we will weather this situation by all working together.

He then addressed some specific questions he had received in the past week:

- We have a 60-day freeze on all positions except faculty positions; the freeze certainly does not apply only to secretaries at the departmental level. The salary savings from that 60-day freeze help offset part of the deficit issue that we have.
- The number of students for classes offered on campus in summer of 2003 will increase. It will also increase for the academic year starting in the fall and spring 2004.

- There are no salary increases anywhere in the Governor's recommended budget for anybody, so faculty and administrators cannot "forego" a salary increase to guarantee our classified employees will keep their jobs.
- National Public Radio reported that Chancellor Meredith had indicated that staff might need to be cut. Georgia Southern has no intention of cutting faculty or staff, but in talking to the legislature the administration is making it clear that if the bleeding does not stop they will put us in the situation where the administration will have to seriously consider that. Some universities are already playing that card; Georgia Southern is not right now because he is of the opinion we won't have to get there.

President Grube asked that any questions that come up be forwarded to Provost Vandegrift or to a Dean or somebody who will get an answer back because this is the time for rumor control: He doesn't want people worrying unduly.

President Grube then asked Ron Core (Vice President, Business and Finance) to speak: When we got our allocation for 2003, our state appropriation had been reduced by 5.82 percent. This totaled \$4.2 million. We were also told then once the year started that our budgets wouldn't be cut, but there would holdbacks and we've gone through a series of three holdbacks during the course of the year. We started out with 1 percent of our state appropriation in which funding for instruction was exempted from that holdback. Then an additional 2 percent, and here again instruction was exempted. Then we got an additional 2 percent where instruction was not exempted. During the course of this year, then, we've had holdbacks of roughly \$2.4 million on top of the \$4.2 million cut. This has been addressed in three ways:

1. Because of our increased enrollment, we have increased tuition revenue to apply against the holdbacks.
2. We instituted a hiring slowdown where all staff and administrative positions were required to be held vacant for at least 60 days to generate some lap salary funds to apply against the holdbacks.
3. We've also had other unfilled positions and reductions in travel and operating supplies that were used to offset the \$2.4 million.

For FY 04 what the administration anticipates at this point in time is an additional \$3.6 million reduction, though there is noise out of the Capitol that there may be reductions in addition to that. Also re: FY 04, at this point in time, there has been no approval of salary increases, and also there will be no funding for health insurance premium increases, making an additional \$1.6 million expense that we'll have next year that we don't have this year that right now we don't have funding for.

Provost Vaughn Vandegrift spoke next about how this will impact the summer program and the academic program for next year, and noted that he would hold an open forum on February 25 to explain these things in more detail and address other issues.

Georgia Southern is doing some things in the summer program a little bit differently this year and that is driven by the budget. This year the University administration provided monies for the instructional program to each Dean and asked those Deans to generate a specified number of credit hours from the salary monies provided. A decision made in Academic Affairs last year makes this budget driven, and that is as follows: We do have a summer salary budget. That summer salary budget was reduced by \$300,000 in lieu of eliminating six faculty positions. In order then to generate the \$300,000 that we no longer have in the summer salary program, we need to increase our summer school efficiency by about 10 percent. Our average class size last summer was about 20-21; we will need to average about 23 in classes this summer. All of the other things about how the program is managed are determined locally by the dean. Re: the 9% salary formula for a three-credit course, the Dean may negotiate more or less with the faculty member if that's agreeable to the faculty. Also, there is no guarantee of any specified number of credits for faculty to teach in the summer; that is subject to local negotiations involving the Dean and the faculty member. The bottom line is that we must be about 10 percent more efficient to regenerate money used to save faculty lines. He noted that we have always generated more money in the summer than we have spent on salaries and that has always been a part of the regular university budget.

Provost Vandegrift then moved to the question of faculty searches: Some 68-70 searches were approved this year and conducted in good faith on the understanding that they might be cancelled re: last minute budget cuts. Because of different disciplinary practices, some departments and colleges filled more vacancies than others before a further \$1.346 million was cut from Academic Affairs. Deans and Chairs put all budget items on the table, but since 80-85% of the Academic Affairs budget is salaries they wound up having to prioritize searches; on the morning of this Senate meeting Provost Vandegrift and each Dean finalized a list of searches to be terminated, and he and the Deans are as unhappy about this as everyone else. Overall, 13 searches have been stopped, 7 lines opened by retirement will not be filled, 5 staff or administration lines will not be filled, and several remaining lines had funds reduced. Also, depending on the college, travel funds were reduced by Deans, though none eliminated. Further, the Graduate Faculty Development Fund (that fund that gave \$150 to associate graduate faculty and \$300 to full graduate faculty) has been eliminated on the recommendation of Dean Hardy.

Richard Rogers (CLASS) asked when and how a process of reallocating existing resources to make up for the inequities created by a first-come-first-served philosophy of cutting positions, might be initiated. Provost Vandegrift said likely next year the administration will prioritize lines at the beginning of the search process. President Grube added that when budgets improve, those hit by eliminations now will be first in line then.

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) asked for a summary of the thirteen positions that were unfunded or cut. The Provost noted Deans had not yet had time to speak to their Chairs and faculty and did not want to preclude the opportunity for the Dean to explain to those departments the priority listing of that Dean.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked how the budget cuts in the state will affect the financial aid of our students. President Grube said the budget cuts at this point are not affecting student financial aid. In terms of HOPE, the Governor has been very clear that HOPE is one of those things he wants the lottery money to continue to preserve. Secondly, the vast bulk of student financial aid

is federal funding, and thus far the administration is not anticipating that student financial aid generally is going to take a hit.

Carol Cornwell (CHHS) asked if for summer there is a lower cap on the number of students in order to make the course; she had heard it might be 10 or more. Provost Vandegrift has told the Deans that he would review any classes that had 10 or fewer students at the graduate level, and maybe 15 at the undergraduate. If the Dean can manage lower numbers, it will be justified.

President Grube noted that some colleges, like the College of Education, use summer to educate many of their graduate students, other departments offer the high demand core courses, others have specialized courses that have to happen. Thus, the Provost has given the Deans targets both financially as well as in terms of the number of credit hours so that those decisions can be worked out locally between the Deans and the departments, with some check on what might be an absolute minimum number of students in a class.

Provost Vandegrift noted we've improved our retention from first to second year and second to third year by 8 to 10 percentage points, and one thing that has contributed significantly to that is the commitment of faculty to offer the 1000 and 2000 level courses in the summer because these enable students to transition from the first to second year and the second to third year. He believes we need to emphasize the 1000 and 2000 level offerings for that purpose, especially since, in a bit of serendipity, they also get pretty good enrollment, so it's a benefit in many ways.

Sandra Peacock (CLASS) asked what the budget impact will be on graduate assistants or graduate assistantships. Provost Vandegrift foresaw no negative impact on graduate assistantships.

David Allen (CLASS, Senate Moderator) asked for confirmation that summer class sizes would increase and for assurances that these increases would not be permanent. Provost Vandegrift replied that class size increases were not mandated but were the likely outcome of Deans being told to increase "efficiency" by 10% to deal with the reduced budget. He could give no assurances re: the future. He also noted that faculty could decline to teach a summer class if they were unwilling to deal with the increased numbers.

Recalling a situation in the Psychology Department, Krug (CLASS) noted that a faculty member might feel obligated to teach a certain class because of the program requirements. Rogers (CLASS) pointed out that Psychology has three summer-only classes built in to its 2 year masters program, but some faculty had agreed to teach these at the time of the program's inception, so they are obligated, but in general other faculty are not. President Grube noted such situations are why only general targets were given college-wide, that such decisions need to be made as locally as possible between the Deans and the departments and the faculty in the college. Provost Vandegrift emphasized that for this year we are pretty much committed to what the administration has done, but for future years they could eliminate six faculty lines and put the money back into the summer budget. President Grube re-emphasized the University's "prime

directive” re: the budget is to preserve personnel. He also noted that tenure and promotion actions will still be funded.

## **5. Report from David Allen, Chair, Senate Executive Committee**

A number of motions were addressed to SEC this month:

1. A motion from Larry Mutter and Allen himself to simplify graduate faculty status; this has been referred to the Graduate Committee.
2. A series of motions from the Faculty Welfare Committee; two of those motions were on the agenda. Two other motions having to do with physical and verbal harassment were sent back by the SEC to the Faculty Welfare Committee to come up with more specific proposals for the Senate before they come to the floor.
3. A number of motions from the Elections Committee to work out a format for incorporating the Information Technology (IT) college into the Faculty Senate. The SEC recommended a simple format in which we could carry this out right now, without any ongoing plans for how to reapportion the Senate or grow the Senate. The SEC proposed that at this point we give the minimum of two seats to the IT college, which will be joining us in July, and that we subtract one seat each from COBA and COST, which are the Colleges from which some faculty are migrating into the new school. Another whole question was future reapportionment and census taking, and finally some issues that needed to be addressed in the *Bylaws*.

## **6. Reapportionment, census taking and adding the new Information Technology College: Jim LoBue (COST, Senate Elections Committee Chair)**

LoBue distributed a fact sheet re: faculty numbers and distribution among the colleges; the information contained therein was the best available, but was not necessarily 100% accurate (suggesting the need for a census). With Information Technology coming on-line this Fall, he proposed a motion that they hold a special election in August for seating of their Senators for the first Senate meeting in September, all of this contingent on the College developing an election process; the motion was seconded.

Discussion ensued as to which issues to deal with today, and in what order. Allen (CLASS, Senate Moderator) suggested the first issue should be to move one Senator each from COST and COBA to IT; Cyr (CLASS) opined that general reapportionment was a vexed issue and we needed to get IT represented before getting into it; LoBue wanted to bypass discussion of how IT would elect anyone and where the seats would come from until it was decided that they would get 2 seats and would have some kind of election; Mark Edwards (COST) wanted to discuss apportionment and census taking first.

Allen stepped in and proposed the Senate start with the simple – getting IT set to go – and move on to the more complex later – census taking and general reapportionment, which would require much discussion and strategic thinking. Krug (CLASS) called the question on LoBue’s motion; it was approved.

LoBue then moved to the *Bylaws*, wherein “five colleges” are specifically referred to

several times. He presented two pages of specific revisions to remove the specific number of colleges from the language. Allen pointed out that a *Bylaws* amendment needed to be formally proposed for the next meeting, which would allow time for Senators to read and consider the wording before voting. Peacock (CLASS) asked how many faculty would be in IT; LoBue could only estimate about 31-32. Carol Cornwell (CHHS) asked what “unit” referred to in the proposed revisions; LoBue answered that it referred to each college and the library, and invited proposals for clearer wording.

LoBue then noted some of the difficulties involved in apportionment and that the *Bylaws* and *Statutes* do not discuss how it is to be done. The Elections Committee is going to work up some methods and models for Senate consideration, dealing with census taking, apportionment, and the number of Senators. But that was for the future; no big changes were being contemplated for right now because they would gum up the works while getting IT on-line.

A fair bit of discussion then ensued re: those “big changes” anyway; after some time, it became apparent why the Elections Committee needs to work up clear options for Senate consideration. Edwards (COST) suggested we get back to the business at hand. Cyr (CLASS) made a motion that one Senate seat each from COST and COBA be moved to IT so they’d actually have something to elect in their just approved special August election; seconded.

John Brown (COBA) pointed out that the SEC is charged with handling apportionment. Krug (CLASS) found the language in the *2002-3 Handbook*: “review and revise as appropriate the apportionment of Senators from the colleges and the library according to the *Statutes*.” LoBue pointed out, though, that this doesn’t say how to do it.

Jim Stephens (COE) queried whether the present motion needed to address the election processes of COST and COBA. LoBue and Allen pointed out that they would just elect one less Senator each and turnover would cover it; no one would actually be turfed out of the Senate. Stephens suggested the motion include directions to COBA and COST to elect fewer Senators than they’re used to. The friendly amendment was accepted; the amended motion was approved.

## **7. Report from David Dudley, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee on Domestic Partners issue**

The Faculty Welfare Committee was charged by the Senate last Spring to investigate the issue of making benefits available to domestic partners of University System faculty and staff and made some discoveries, among them a good definition of “domestic partner” and that we have not come to this issue alone or even first. For example, Emory University and Agnes Scott College, both private schools, but prestigious and representative of what in many ways is the best that our state has to offer, already offer full domestic partnership benefits and have for some time. Within the State System, Georgia State currently provides domestic partner benefits that do not need Board of Regents approval. Georgia Tech provides limited benefits. Also, this last Fall UGA University Council authorized its President Adams to petition the Board of Regents to grant domestic partnership benefits to domestic partners. The Faculty Welfare Committee believes that domestic partners benefits would be a good thing for the State System, and for Georgia Southern University for reasons of fairness and recruiting, and because studies show that they would present no significant increase in costs to those already in the System. Accordingly, the Faculty Welfare Committee offered two motions to the Senate, the first being, “We move that the Faculty Senate request the appropriate individuals and organizations on the GSU campus to make available to domestic partners of faculty and staff the same privileges currently accorded to



families of faculty and staff.” This motion did not address benefits – that is something that the BOR must decide – but such things as, but not necessarily limited to, the privileges of the use of the RAC, and reduced ticket prices for on-campus events. The motion was seconded and approved.

Dudley (CLASS) then presented a second motion: “The Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the Faculty Senate request President Bruce Grube to forward to the Board of Regents a Senate resolution requesting that domestic partners of faculty and staff at Georgia Southern University be made eligible to receive University System benefits.”

Cornwell (CHHS) made a friendly amendment to clarify the wording re: the motion including full health benefits: “full system benefits including health benefits.” Dudley accepted the amendment. Stephens (COE) pointed out that we did not have an actual resolution for President Grube to forward; Dudley agreed, saying the Committee had wanted permission to proceed before drafting one. Flynn (CLASS) suggested the amended motion was such a resolution; Cyr (CLASS) agreed. Dudley demurred, noting the motion mentioned a resolution but no separate written resolution was extant; he also noted that the Faculty Welfare Committee had been undecided over whether to be brief or “become eloquent and persuasive and use the power of our words.” Cyr (CLASS) suggested that they could add the rationales, but personally he favored the short and pithy version.

Brown (COBA) and Cyr suggested the motion be withdrawn and the issue brought back when the Committee has a formal written resolution; Flynn wanted to vote on the current motion so the Senate went on record as in favor of such a resolution. Stephens (COE) wanted a formal motion to direct the Committee to bring a written resolution to the next Senate meeting for discussion and a vote, and a further motion on how to forward it to the BOR. Dudley withdrew his motion; Stephens’ motion was seconded and approved.

## **8. Nomination and Election of Moderator**

LoBue (COST) nominated Marc Cyr (CLASS); Edwards (COST) nominated John Brown (COBA). There were no other nominations. 34 Senators voted by secret ballot: 1 abstention, 13 for Brown, 20 for Cyr. Cyr will chair the SEC for 2003-4.

## **9. Appoint new Senate member to sit on Parking and Transportation Appeals Committee**

Jeanette Rice (COST) had already volunteered for the position, so the issue was taken care of.

## **10. Report from Mike Mills, SPC Representative**

SACS are coming. The Strategic Planning Council in response to a January 7<sup>th</sup> charge delivered by President Bruce Grube has begun identifying topics for a “quality enhancement plan or a QEP.” This University-wide plan, which is a new SACS requirement, will be submitted as part of GSU’s reaccreditation process, and will be the centerpiece of Georgia Southern’s SACS efforts. This plan is not just a report, but rather a plan of action that will be closely tied to what the University wants to become in the next decade. According to SACS, the QEP must have a

clear impact on student learning, but also demonstrate links to on-going planning, must generate campus-wide involvement, and be both successful and assessed. The SPC has been charged with creating a short list of possible topics for the QEP, and is seeking input from the stakeholders in the University, including the faculty. This list will eventually be submitted to the Georgia Southern SACS Leadership Team, headed by President Grube, which will make the final determination of topics and write the final QEP. It needs to be noted that the SPC is not soliciting direct information about the plan or how programs will be involved, but rather input about possible topics from the faculty, staff, and student body. A more detailed description of the plan as well as some possible topics for the QEP will be forthcoming via e-mail and the Academic Affairs newsletter. Dr. Bob Haney will address this issue at the next General Faculty meeting. Faculty input can be sent in maddening amounts to Dr. Jayne Perkins at Institutional Research or other avenues as defined by upcoming mailings, e-mails, and/or Dr. Haney.

#### **11. Report from Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative**

Rogers (CLASS) passed around a report of our student-athletes' academic performance, and team GPAs for each of the sports. He pointed out that, as a group, the women student-athletes have a higher average GPA than all GSU undergraduate women as a group. The men student-athletes have a higher average GPA than the average GPA for all undergraduate men. And, of course, when you combine the genders the average for the student-athletes is also higher than the all-GSU average.

#### **12. Old Business**

Krug (CLASS) noted faculty and student difficulties with the WINGS/electronic-only schedules and wondered if some paper versions could be available for advisors and advisees. Provost Vandegrift said the Academic Advisory Council and Registrar Mike Deal are looking into ways of making known what courses are available at the beginning of the semester.

Krug then asked if the gender equity report given to the University Athletics Committee could be put on the web. No members of that committee remained in the room, so Krug deferred her request to the next meeting.

#### **13. New Business**

Krug (CLASS) queried re: Faculty Grievance Committee elections procedures needing revision re: IT, and re: no ballot for that Committee having been included on the recent Senate omnibus ballot. Marilyn Bruce (President's Office) said last year's Elections Committee Chair, Jean-Paul Carton, had said the Senate would coordinate the Grievance election. This year's chair, LoBue, will consult with Carton and correct the situation.

#### **14. Announcements: Vice Presidents**

Provost Vandegrift announced that this year there were 29 recommendations received through the deans' level for promotion either to associate or full professor, and of those 27 have been forwarded by the President to the System as positively recommended. Regarding tenure, there were 21 considered for tenure: 19 have been recommended up, one was non-recommended,

and one is being held in abeyance pending receipt of further information.

Re: attendance verification, it continues to go generally well, but there are still some issues to resolve and Dr. Bleicken, the Provost, Registrar Mike Deal and Alison Ridley (Associate Vice President) are working to make that process run even more smoothly in the future, and eventually we will be hearing recommendations.

Linda Bleicken (VPSA & Enrollment Management) noted we did have a student who was diagnosed with Bacterial Meningitis at the end of January. His name is Esli Saint-Louis, freshman, housed in Winburn Hall. He was hospitalized successfully at Memorial Medical in Savannah but is no longer in hospital. He is intending to return to Georgia Southern.

She then announced Scholars Day, coming up on February 28<sup>th</sup> and March 1<sup>st</sup>. This is a collaborative effort between Admissions and Academic Affairs to bring approximately 200 high-ability students to campus. These students have SATs in excess of 1250, and will compete for scholarships that we have available at Georgia Southern, and engage in a day-long process of interviews. She then thanked faculty for participation in some record-breaking events — an Atlanta reception on January 28<sup>th</sup>, and an open house here on campus the previous Saturday.

## **15. Announcements from the Floor**

Karen McCurdy (CLASS, Chair of Faculty Research Committee) announced that the Faculty Research Committee has recommended changes to the Faculty Grant Competition and are currently planning a Faculty Forum, in association with Acting Dean Charlie Hardy, for some time at the end of February or early March.

Mark Edwards (COST) circulated a flyer about the Department of Physics and the Georgia Southern University Honors Programs co-sponsoring a distinguished lecture series: The first speaker will be Dr. Eric Cornell, March 10<sup>th</sup> in the Russell Union Ballroom. Eric Cornell won the Nobel Prize in Physics in the year 2001. President Grube complimented Edwards: This is the second year in a row that he has brought a Nobel Prize Winner in to talk to this campus.

John Brown (COBA), campus President of the American Association of University Professors, announced a coffee to which all faculty are invited, Thursday, March 6<sup>th</sup>, from 9:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. on the second floor of the Lakeside Café. He hoped all will join and help AAUP support academic freedom, due process, and tenure.

Gary Dartt (CLASS) announced the opening performances of the *Matchmaker* in the Performing Arts Center.

Allen (CLASS, Moderator) moved for adjournment; seconded and approved.

## **16. Adjournment**

Submitted by Marc D. Cyr, Senate Secretary \_\_\_\_\_

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**Russell Union Ballroom**  
**March 27, 2003**

Senators (or Alternates) in Attendance: John Brown, (Elynor Davis for Constance Campbell), (Susan Trimble for Ruth Carroll), Diana Cone, Carol Cornwell, Phyllis Dallas, Gary Dartt, Cordelia Douzenis, (Susan Trimble for Elizabeth Downs), David Dudley, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Bob Fernekes, Mary Hadley, Alice Hall, Clara Krug, (Carol Nessmith for Susie Lanier), Bill Levernier, Jim LoBue, (Chuck Johnson for Karl Manrodt), Karen McCurdy, Mary Marwitz, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Jeanette Rice, David Robinson, Debra Skinner, David Stone, Stuart Tedders, Deborah Thomas, Susan Trimble.

Senators Absent: Sharon Barrs, Chris Geyerman, Steve Jenkins, John Kim, Jonathan Perkins, Ann Pratt, Jim Stephens, Matthew Williamson, Jerry Wilson

Senate Officers in Attendance: Martha Abell, David Allen, Marc Cyr, Richard Flynn, Jeff McLellan, Mike Mills

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Vaughn Vandegrift, Linda Bleicken, Ron Core, Bede Mitchell, Marilyn Bruce

Visitors: Bob Haney, Kathleen Comerford, Candace Griffith, Lorne Wolfe, Jennie Dilworth

---

**1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 27, 2003, Meeting.**

David Allen (CLASS, Senate Moderator) moved approval; seconded and passed.

**2. Approval of the February 12, 2003, Minutes:**

[Secretary's Note: This motion was delayed until partway into item 3's discussion because the Secretary had stepped out to answer a call in a small room nearby. Therefore, these minutes do not reflect the actual chronology of the first ten minutes or so of the meeting.)

Marc Cyr (CLASS, Senate Secretary) noted that he had received some corrections and requests for clarification: A typo on page 1, second line from the bottom, in item 3, "page 2 or" should read "page 2 of." In that same section, in the first line on page 2, "whit" should read "wit." As well, clarification for two parts of the minutes were requested. The first involved the use of "Senate Moderator" and "Chairman of the SEC" as synonymous terms in item 8 on page 8. Technically, the Senate elects the SEC Chair. By BOR regulations, Senate meetings are presided over by the President, or someone he or she designates. President Grube proposed that the Faculty Senate meeting should be conducted by a faculty member and he designated the SEC Chair to perform that duty. Hence, the SEC Chair is Moderator, by courtesy of the President. The other clarification had to do with section 4, page 4, in which Provost Vandegrift announced the elimination of the Graduate Faculty Development Fund. The transcript of the meeting does not identify the faculty member who asked the Provost to clarify which fund he was referring to. That speaker was Moderator David Allen, who thought he must have misheard because 20 minutes earlier that fund had seemed to be alive and well, and was discussed by Graduate Committee Chair Jerry Wilson. The secretary's note to Dr. Wilson's comments on page 2 of the

minutes may have added to the confusion. Anyway, the fund discussed by Wilson and the Graduate Faculty Fund pronounced eliminated by the Provost are one and the same.

Cyr then moved approval; seconded and passed.

### **3. Librarian's Report March 17, 2003**

Richard Flynn (CLASS, Senate Librarian) moved acceptance. Clara Krug (CLASS), suggesting general ignorance of the Librarian's Report's existence requested that the following information about the March 17 report be included and highlighted in the current minutes: The final paragraph on page one of the report notes that concern that the Faculty Handbook should be revised to include a statement about review of promotions and tenure at the Deans' Council level was brought to the table. The ensuing discussion clarified that the Deans' input at this level is advisory to the Provost: after they make recommendations on the applications from their colleges, they review all recommendations from all colleges and advise the Provost individually in their advisory role. They function at this level much like the departmental promotion committees and the college promotion committees function at the other two levels mentioned in the handbook statement on promotion, except that their advice is individual, not made as a group, as is usually the case with promotion committees at the other two levels. The Provost is charged with making a recommendation to the President and he considers input from various constituencies. The Deans do not review tenure applications at this level. With this explanation the committee saw no need for the suggested revisions of wording and Professor Dudley withdrew the proposed changes. She was quoting from page one of the Faculty Senate Librarian's Report of March 17, 2003. [Secretary's Note: A message had been sent to Senate Listserv, the Faculty Listserv, the Deans and Vice Presidents that the Librarian's Report had been posted to the web on March 19, 2003; go to <http://www2.gasou.edu/FacultySenate/>]

Krug then noted her inability to get to attachments noted on page 44 – changes in the catalog for Women and Gender Studies – and page 58 – proposed revised curriculum forms. Flynn apologized for not attaching them; he would get them posted correctly. Those two items were put in abeyance for approval next time; the amended minutes were approved.

#### **a. Undergraduate Committee Minutes: Report from Undergraduate Committee**

Phyllis Dallas (CLASS, Co-Chair, Undergraduate Committee) called the Senate's attention to the new procedure associated with the revised curriculum forms. The agendas for the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees will be posted on the electronic bulletin board two weeks prior to each meeting, which will mean that the agenda must be submitted to the Registrar's office three weeks before the scheduled meeting. This is a change in the timetable for actions going before the Undergraduate Committee and means that all faculty will have an opportunity to see what curriculum changes are going before the Undergraduate and the Graduate Committees. Another item had to do with information literacy discussion. Because the report of the Undergraduate Committee on the survey of faculty views on the extent to which core courses assist students in attaining the University's General Education Outcomes recorded in the Faculty Senate Librarian's Report of June 24, 2002, indicated that further study was needed regarding the outcomes about modern technology and information literacy, the Library's

representatives on the Undergraduate Committee have provided the committee with the American Library Association's Statement on Information Literacy. The committee has been discussing how to proceed in further investigating the outcome regarding information literacy. They decided a questionnaire to department chairs might prove useful. They further decided to expand the questionnaire to include other outcomes which the survey indicated might not be adequately addressed, namely the outcomes on oral communications and writing across the curriculum and the study of foreign languages.

**b. Graduate Committee Minutes: Report from Graduate Committee**

Richard Flynn (CLASS), delivered the Graduate Committee Report for Jerry Wilson: Aside from the various curriculum changes and program changes included in the Librarian's Report, they have been examining a revised, much simplified procedure for a faculty member obtaining graduate faculty status. They expect to have a proposal come out of the next Graduate Committee meeting. Also, they are figuring out how to administer the Graduate Faculty Development Fund, and plan to have a report that will let a Graduate Committee in the future take this up, if we get the Graduate Faculty Development Fund back, and not have to duplicate current efforts.

**4. President's Report:**

President Grube noted the following:

- A major supporter of Georgia Southern, Regent John Hunt, died; he will be missed.
- We have no additional budget cuts for '03; the battle for '04 not starts and it looks ugly, especially since the tobacco tax was defeated.
- Scholars' Day was very successful: About 200 high-ability students were interviewed re: scholarships. Very positive reviews suggest we'll enroll many of them.
- He thanked Mark Edwards for bringing to campus a Nobel Laureate speaker, the second such speaker he has arranged in two years.
- The General Faculty Meeting of March 13 dealt with the budget; SACS; and Parking.
- International visitors: A Japanese delegation; Peter Schnell, Lord Mayor of Ingolstadt, Germany, with whose Fachhochschule we have an exchange program; biologist Soren Nielsen from Roskilde University in Denmark; Dr. Victor Arredondo, Rector of the University of Veracruz, with whom we have an exchange program. He thanked Nancy Shumaker for organizing these visits.
- He noted the Highway 301/Old Register Road beautification project is going slowly. President Grube promised Gary Dartt that they won't dynamite the scene shop until another great location for it is found.

- Given the usual end-of-year rush and crush of business, he urged everyone to be kind and patient because from top to bottom the University community is frazzled. He then paraphrased Gloria Gaynor.

## **5. Report from David Allen, Chair, Senate Executive Committee**

Allen (CLASS) welcomed David Robinson (CLASS), who will complete Sandra Peacock's unexpired term, and then turned to other issues:

- SEC meeting minutes are now being posted on the web.

- the SEC has just begun consideration of whether non-participation of Senate members on the Senate or committees is a problem and, if so, how to deal with it.

- the SEC is meeting with standing committee chairs and the chair of the ad-hoc task force on governance in an effort to make the committee structure more collective, systematic, and hence effective. Overall, things seem to be working very well, and promising procedural innovations have been suggested and/or implemented by the chairs of the Faculty Research and Undergraduate Committees.

- the April 24<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting promises to have a packed agenda; Senator should be prepared to go at least until 6:00.

## **6. Report from Mike Mills (CLASS), SPC Representative**

A campus-wide request for input from faculty, staff, and the student body about possible topics for the SACS Report Quality Enhancement Plan produced robust and very thoughtful input. The SPC narrowed the input to a list of five possible topics for the QEP, an integral part of the SACS Reaccreditation Process. These topics are still being refined and will soon be forwarded to the University's SACS Steering Committee to decide on a final topic for the QEP sometime in the near future. These topics will be reflected in upcoming SPC minutes. Also, the SPC listened to the master parking plan presented by Joe Franklin and Bob Chambers. The SPC was asked to determine whether or not the parking plan was consistent with the Level I Strategic Plan. In many instances, such as this one, the Strategic Plan offers no clear and specific guidance regarding the strictly yes or no response to any particular part of the plan. The SPC will forward its recommendations to President Grube in the near future.

Krug (CLASS) wondered what faculty voices had been heard re: the parking plan, noting that Director of Auxiliary Services Joe Franklin had told her that his understanding was that Mills and other faculty on the SPC (Martha Abell and Trey Denton) were the Senate (i.e. faculty) voice. Mills noted they act as faculty members but only within the parameters of the Strategic Plan, that is, deciding whether issues do or do not fit its established framework. Abell (COST) confirmed they do not act as a "voice of the faculty" *per se* on the SPC, but such voices were heard by Franklin at the open forum on parking and the General Faculty Meeting.

Allen (Moderator, CLASS) noted that he and GSEN (Georgia Southern Environmental Network) chair Ray Chandler sit on the Physical Planning Committee, to which the Master Parking Plan was presented in late February; they had not felt that was sufficient. He noted Joe Franklin and Bob Chambers would again present the plan later in this present meeting.

Cyr (CLASS) noted that various current University plans and actions seem based on enrollment projections, and asked Mills and Abell whether the SPC knew what those projections are and on what they are based. President Grube fielded the question: He noted that the Regents, Legislature, and Governor, among other constituencies, and not just our University, decide the rate of growth and ultimate enrollment at GSU. Growth projections, then, are a complex puzzle. On our own, though, we have dampened freshman admissions via higher standards, but are growing our enrollments of graduate, non-traditional, Continuing Education, and Distance Learning students. Budget considerations re: “funding formulas” also impact projections; unsure budgets equal more unsure projections. Two items point to growth, however: Increasing high school graduation rates indicate a coming 10 year growth spurt, and the University of Georgia is capping itself at about 33,000 total while simultaneously growing its graduate programs; we are working towards being the alternative (not a “second choice”) at the undergraduate level.

Linda Bleiken (VPSA), head of the Enrollment Management Council (EMC), noted that though last Fall we admitted 100 fewer freshmen than the year before, we grew 704 overall mostly because of our increased retention rate at all undergraduate levels; we moved from 75% to 77% from ‘01 to ‘02. This is a major public indicator of our quality, and these students we held on to generated \$2 million extra revenue. The Fall ‘03 freshman class size is likely to remain the same as ‘02, but we hope for an increase via further retention. She thanked faculty for being a large influence on the retention rates.

President Grube noted hopes to achieve over 80% retention, and that our rate is 82% for African-Americans (87% for the System as a whole): We are 2<sup>nd</sup> in the USA in terms of African-American business school graduates, and in overall African-American graduates 14<sup>th</sup> in the country among traditionally white universities. He then encouraged the SPC to work closely with the EMC because so many SPC issues, especially capital building projects, are tied to the complex and uncertain issue of enrollment.

In short, it appears that, although they need them, the SPC does not have solid and/or reliable enrollment projections to work with because so many streams flow into and affect this fluid situation.

## **7. Presentation on the Master Parking Plan**

Ron Core (VPBF) introduced the presentation by noting that the campus-wide physical master plan presented at Fall ‘02 convocation was not detailed enough re: parking, so that fall he asked Joe Franklin (Director of Auxiliary Services) and Bob Chambers (Director of Parking and Transportation) to develop a separate master parking plan, which they did in consultation with President Grube. It is this plan that was first presented to the Campus Physical Planning Committee in late February, and subsequently to an open forum, at the General Faculty Meeting, to student groups, the Dean’s Council, and to Student Affairs Directors.



[Secretary's Note: Perhaps worn out by this itinerary, the Power Point presentation equipment quit and could not be persuaded to work again. Joe Franklin was thereby forced to solo *a cappella*.]

Franklin noted that construction of the IT building eliminated 354 spaces, and student dissatisfaction with parking was already high: the ACT survey report from Fall '01 rated it lower than any service on campus and lower than the national average (he noted parking is, however, a traditionally low-scoring service), they were receiving lots of complaints in the parking office, and President Grube was hearing complaints at community meetings. Hence the Master Parking Plan was conceived.

Two areas have critical over-demand: Russell Union and the West End (Henderson Library to College of Education). The West End has the biggest deficit of commuter spaces because of recent and current building re: Business, Technology, Education, Information Technology, and Nursing/Chemistry. Franklin then presented a list of issues (without benefit of clarifying Power Point visuals):

- Library construction will eliminate 169 faculty/staff spots; these will be replaced re: shifting, for example putting 24 behind Lewis Hall and shifting 54 student slots to faculty/staff in the Education lot.
- Dorman Hall will be torn down and its 142 spots turned commuter, which should make the Russell Union area okay.
- Hanner area is okay.
- West End needs several new lots; the first will be 300 at Forest Drive and Old Register Road. Franklin noted receiving much opposition re: cutting woods, but planned a 120 foot wooded border to obscure the lot.
- re: aesthetics, the Engineering Technology lot will be moved back from the building and expanded; there will also be landscaping.
- re: Dorman Hall again, once gone its place will be taken by 118 commuter spaces.
- Herty Drive, from Georgia Avenue to Cone Hall, will become a pedestrian in Fall '03 (part of the plan to move traffic away from the center of campus).

[Secretary's Note: pedestrians will be closed to regular traffic but allow use by service, emergency, and other such traffic.]

Franklin paused to note that the above changes would give sufficient parking for Fall '03. Without them, they might have to look for an alternative, like reducing demand. He then turned to Fall '04:

- Georgia Avenue, from Hollis to Russell Union, turned pedestrian.

- Herty lot removed, i.e. 34 faculty/staff spots gone.
- Hollis lot to be modified and landscaped, losing some spaces.

Franklin paused to note that he, too, was now becoming confused. Then he forged on:

- the serious and dangerous traffic at Russell Union will require lot entrance/exit and traffic pattern changes.
- 20 new faculty/staff spots behind Math/Physics.
- lots of landscaping.
- for Fall '05, Forest Drive from Russell Union to Counseling Center turns pedestrian, causing the loss of Carruth lot and 41 faculty/staff spots at COBA/Newton.
- more landscaping.
- Fall '06, a new lot between Herty Pines (120 feet will separate Herty Pines from the lot) and the baseball field, re: faculty/staff and visitors (such as baseball fans).

Allen (Moderator) asked if the plan were available for public study; Franklin noted its length and said copies would be available to read at the Library, the Parking office, and his own office. He also offered to sit down and talk about it with anyone for any time. Chuck Johnson (COBA) suggested putting it on the web, noting how it could be done easily. Franklin noted that as a potentiality.

Allen then asked biology professor Lorne Wolfe to speak for GSEN. Wolfe noted GSEN's particular concerns as the Herty Pines and Old Register proposed lots re: incalculable loss from forever destroying natural forests for a short-term parking fix. GSEN feels the plan was promulgated on inaccurate assumptions: With RAC and Paulson Stadium, there is abundant campus parking. Also, the plan's assumption that students must park within a "15 minute walk" of all their classes is incompatible with the proposed pedestrian-friendly campus. GSEN offered four alternatives:

- Encourage students via incentives like PE credit to walk or bike to class.
- Create a mass transit system. This will be implemented apparently when this University reaches 17,000. Why not start it immediately, to minimize the growing pains of this new system?
- Offer carpoolers high quality parking options.
- As Franklin had mentioned elsewhere, offer more Friday classes to alter traffic patterns and therefore reduce the need for creating more lots.

Wolfe noted student support for these initiatives via a blind survey he conducted earlier in the day of 144 students from across the campus. He offered six results: 46 percent did not know that they could park for free at Paulson Stadium or the RAC. 85 percent said they would use a mass transit system if it was coupled with free parking at the RAC or Paulson. 92 percent said

they would carpool, especially if they would obtain a parking pass in a prime lot. 51 percent said they would be willing to leave their car at home and walk or bike if they got PE credit. The vast majority of students said all students are going to complain no matter what system they have unless they all have a dedicated lot beside every building. Not a single student had chosen GSU because of its parking. Wolfe also suggested the parking lot funds could be used to hire faculty; President Grube pointed out that Auxiliary funds cannot be applied to other University needs.

Carol Cornwell (CHHS) wanted to speak as a representative of the School of Nursing, which is about 250 students and 25 faculty, the majority of whom are women, to call for a closer look at the wetlands that are going to be destroyed, partly because of the natural habitat issues, but also because of the documented fact that sexual and other forms of assault occur on campuses in areas that are not well lit and that are on the periphery of campuses.

David Stone (COST) asked what, if any, studies have been done re: implementing a transit system with peripheral parking. Franklin said the cost depended on the number of students being moved: A stopgap system moving 1,000 students would cost about \$12 per semester (paid by all students, not just the 1,000). To move 3,500, improvements to the Paulson lot, buying buses, etc. means about a \$2 million start-up and \$700,000 per year (\$7 million more over ten years). And we don't know if or when we'll reach the 17,000 student point when transit is absolutely needed. Stone suggested we will reach that point some time; if we wait, we'll have to cut down every tree left to accommodate it. Franklin noted improvements to Paulson would be sufficient because the number of appropriate locations for parking lots has just about reached its end. Stone asked if Tech and UGA use transit; Franklin said they do via a mandatory transit fee for all students, which is what we would have to do; because it's HOPE eligible, this would be a hard sell in Atlanta right now. He believed the current plans to create more parking lots are an acceptable solution to the transit problem.

Allen (Moderator) noted that Franklin had cited \$2.7 million for transit at the General Faculty meeting, but today had cited between \$7 and \$9 million. Franklin noted the lower figure was to move 1,000, the higher for 3,500.

David Robinson (CLASS) congratulated Parking on how well they've done so far on ridding the central area of campus of traffic. But he noted almost no alternatives to a "everybody drives and parks" method have been tried: He noted that if a person wants to bike some days and drive others, that person must still pay a full, every-day-of-the-year fee. He suggested trying systems that would encourage less frequent use of cars, though that option would be open if needed. Robinson felt this would reduce demand for parking spaces. He called himself a fairly wacky extremist; often, he may be viewed on a bicycle.

Franklin noted the philosophy Parking has used to date is "cheap parking for everyone," not discouraging people from driving to campus via alternatives of which Parking is aware, like parking zones or higher fees.

Visiting faculty member Kathleen Comerford asked on what studies the 1,000/3,500 student systems and the cost projections for transit were based, and asked for clarification of the costs to students under the current system: What is the differential between the cited and forbidding \$7 million figure for transit and the cost figure for students re: parking? She noted her doctoral

school charged a separate fee for parking, one for a bus pass. She also disagreed that current forest and wetland areas are appropriate places for parking lots.

Franklin tried to sort through her issues: The 1,000 students are in stadium area housing and could easily be required to use a bus; Parking computed how many buses, etc. to reach the \$2.7 million figure. The 3,500 students are these plus those in housing about a ten minute walk from the stadium; that's \$7 million because more buses would be needed. All costs are re: service from Paulson to Education. Door-to-door or around town would be even more.

An inaudible question prompted Franklin to say a mandatory transit fee charged to every student, rather than a separate and user-paid bus fare, would be our method of paying for transit. Spread over 15,000 students it would not cost each student much; for 1,000/3,500 only paying, it would be counter-productively prohibitively expensive.

President Grube noted, with trepidation, to the Senate that faculty are the second most important group on campus; students are #1. He noted two issues that were raised that he said fall within the purview of this Senate. The curriculum issue of rewarding students with class credit for walking or biking, and the issue of scheduling Friday afternoon classes to ease pressure on mid-week peak-traffic hours. He noted 98% of students want "more parking spaces." He also question how many people in the room including himself, would be willing to park at Paulson and be bused in to center-campus. [Secretary's Note: Though no count was taken, President Grube noted late that a lot of hands were raised at this point.]

Krug asked how many buses we already own. Franklin said buses used for various events are rented by other campus entities, not Auxiliary Services; neither he nor VP Bleiken knew the cost.

Chuck Johnson (COBA) noted that 3,500 students paying a user-only fee would pay about \$100 each; an all-student mandatory fee would be quite low and eminently doable. [Secretary's Note: \$750,000 divided by 3,500 equals about \$215; divided by 15,000 equals \$50. Our current parking fee is \$54.] Johnson also agreed Friday afternoon classes would cut traffic; as current Friday afternoon classes show, students simply won't come to class.

Susan Trimble (COE) noted many present had seen the Parking presentation several times and noted repeated themes: a search for alternatives, the offer of a short-term solution to a major long-term problem, and the lack of data showing that we need more parking right now. She asked about the time-line for considering the recent input from students and faculty, and implementing the parking plan. President Grube replied that such input will be considered in the recommendation made by Bob Chambers, Joe Franklin, and VP Ron Core to the President's Cabinet, which must then decide the issue in the next couple of weeks. He also said students should not bear the cost alone.

Cyr (CLASS) pointed out that faculty paid now to park on campus, and he assumed they would be treated in future the same as now, paying the same as and along with the students, including fee hikes. President Grube had not heard that in the discussion, but would be glad if that's how faculty felt; it sounded to him like faculty were willing to share the burden. He expressed concern that an increased cost – in a year with no raises and a likely health care premium

increase – could be absorbed by faculty, but would be huge for some of the lowest paid University employees.

Krug (CLASS) noted many faculty have ridden buses, while many of our students have not; it would be a wonderful education for them. She said she was not being facetious. She noted also that the *Statesboro Herald* had recently alluded to bus transportation and the difficulty of change boxes; she noted University systems use passes, not change. She also suggested a sliding fee scale for non-faculty employees. She then noted the rarity of people actually asking her to talk, but the following remark had been requested: She suggested “no raises” should mean “no higher fees” if our campus controls those fees, as with parking. She added that no trees are “incidental,” tests will get students to Friday classes, and walking would aid the health of pear-shaped students and imminently diabetic faculty. She had noted earlier that she herself uses a lot of moisturizer.

As he was recognizing John Brown (COBA), Allen (Moderator) noted his desire to bring this discussion to closure. Brown agreed and suggested immediate conclusion because of the late hour and other important issues still on the agenda. Allen said he was not ready to stop right away and asked if there were further questions.

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) recalled the video shown at Fall Convocation and discussion of coordinating the campus and the Statesboro community re: traffic. He asked how that coordination was progressing. President Grube mourned the Power Point machine’s demise, noting that the Fall video predated the revised parking plan pictures that would have been shown, so there would have been changes apparent. He cited Bob Chambers and Joe Franklin’s expertise in the practical day-to-day, operational-level issue of parking, and that for Auxiliary Services – unlike in a classroom – students are customers. Purely on-campus changes re: traffic and parking we handle internally; anything involving off-campus issues is the subject of thorough communication with the city. He praised Franklin, Chambers, and VP Core for putting forward a proposal for consideration, and said the responses have brought many good points forward.

Nielsen couldn’t figure out how HOPE impeded a transit system here, since other campuses have HOPE as well as transit. President Grube fielded this question, noting that Moderator Allen had asked him to be brief: HOPE can be used or all mandatory fees, so there’s always pressure to keep such fees withing that amount, partly because each year we only get a fraction of what we ask for re: even those mandatory fees.

Allen thanked all concerned and concluded discussion. He moved to extend the meeting beyond 6:00. A quorum was still present and the motion passed.

## **8. Senate Bylaws revisions and Update from Jim LoBue, Senate Elections Committee**

LoBue (COST) moved that the *By-Laws* revisions that have been posted on the web for six weeks be approved: They involve changing the itemized references to “five colleges and the library” to the more generic “colleges and the library.” Krug (CLASS) asked if this concerned

changing the number of senators, i.e. apportionment. LoBue and Allen clarified that that was a separate issue and would be on a future agenda. The motions was passed.

#### **9. Report from David Dudley, Chair of Faculty Welfare Committee, on *Faculty Handbook* revisions**

Copies of the revisions had been distributed. Dudley (CLASS) noted that these revisions reflect the way that Faculty Senate is supposed to work, being the result of a communication from a faculty member to the Senate Executive Committee, and then passed on to the Welfare committee. The Welfare Committee sought the input, the insights and the suggestions of the entire faculty, underwent lengthy discussion, and saw a couple of places where the tenure and promotion guidelines could be improved. Dudley then moved acceptance of one amendment and one addition to the *Faculty Handbook*. The amendment is in Section 208 of the *Faculty Handbook*, page 25, and is a rewording of the third sentence in paragraph one:

- “Promotion applications are considered and recommendations made at the department/school, college, and Provost’s level, culminating in an institutional recommendation to the Board of Regents at the President’s level.”

The amendment is the addition of the three words “and recommendations made” so that it is clear that applications for promotion are not only considered at all of the various levels, but that recommendations yea or nay are made at each level. The full addition moved is in Section 209 of the *Faculty Handbook*, page 205, at the beginning of the second paragraph:

“Tenure applications are considered and recommendations made at the department/school, college and Provost’s levels, culminating in an institutional recommendation to the Board of Regents at the President’s level.”

In the Tenure Guidelines section there was no such sentence providing for the consideration of applications at each level. Therefore this is adding material so that under both tenure and promotion sections we have the same wording. The motion was passed.

#### **10. Old Business**

Krug (CLASS) noted that Jill Lockwood asked her to report for the Senate Task Force on the Role of Faculty in Shared Governance. A report will be placed on the web and the task force will report at the next Senate meeting. The report will include a summary of procedures used in surveying faculty opinion, a summary of the results at both the University-wide and college levels, and a summary of the recommendations.

Krug then asked about the status of the printed schedule of classes. LoBue (COST) pointed out that a PDF file is available for the schedules for the classes for Fall Semester, and he thought it had been mailed to everyone.

**11. New Business**

None.

**12. Announcements: Vice Presidents**

Provost Vandegrift announced that Dr. James Bradford has been appointed the Founding Dean of the College of Information Technology. He also announced that the Graduate Faculty Development Fund had no more money than it had at the last meeting, i.e. an unfortunate none.

**13. Announcements from the Floor**

None.

**14. Adjournment**

Respectfully submitted April 14, 2003, by Marc D. Cyr

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**Russell Union Ballroom**  
**April 24, 2003**

Senators (or Alternates) in Attendance: Martha Abell, (Norman E. Schmidt for Sharon Barrs), John Brown, Constance Campbell, Ruth Carroll, Diana Cone, Carol Cornwell, Phyllis Dallas, Gary Dartt, David Dudley, Mark Edwards, Bob Fernekes, Mary Hadley, Alice Hall, Steve Jenkins, Clara Krug, Susie Lanier, Bill Levernier, Jim LoBue, Karl Manrodt, Karen McCurdy, Mary Marwitz, Patrick Novotny, Jeanette Rice, Debra Skinner, Stuart Tedders, Deborah Thomas, (Chuck Johnson for Jerry Wilson)

Senators Absent: Cordelia Douzenis, Elizabeth Downs, John Dyer, Richard Flynn, Chris Geyerman, Michael Nielsen, Ann Pratt, David Robinson, Jim Stephens, David Stone

Senate Officers in Attendance: David Allen, Marilyn Bruce, Marc Cyr, Jeff McLellan, Mike Mills, Richard Rogers

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Charlie Hardy, Bede Mitchell, Vaughn Vandegrift

Visitors: Denise Battles, Rebecca Davis, Bob Haney, Peggy Hargis, Marcia Jones, Jill Lockwood, Jim McMillan, Laura Milner, Larry Mutter

**1. Approval of the Agenda for the April 24, 2003, Meeting.**

David Allen (CLASS, Senate Moderator) moved approval; seconded and approved.

**2. Approval of the March 27, 2003, Minutes:**

Marc Cyr (CLASS Senate Secretary) moved approval; seconded and approved.

**3. Librarian's Report for April 24, 2003, Senate Meeting:** (Secretary's Note: the actual date of the Librarian's Report was 4-18-03)

In the absence of Richard Flynn, Cyr (CLASS) moved approval of the report and of the two attachments that were held in abeyance from March 27<sup>th</sup>. Seconded.

Richard Rogers (Faculty Athletic Representative) noted that in a recent revision of the *Bylaws*, the Faculty Athletics Committee was changed to the University Athletics Committee, and was removed as a standing committee of the Senate. Since that time the minutes of that body have not been included as part of the Librarian's Report, as their actions are not subject to senate approval. The current Librarian's Report included the minutes of the University Athletics Committee and he requested that they be removed before the Librarian's Report is approved. He further noted that the University Athletics Committee minutes are posted on the President's Web Site [http://welcome.gasou.edu/president/Athletics\\_Committee.html](http://welcome.gasou.edu/president/Athletics_Committee.html) for everyone to read. Cyr (CLASS, Senate Secretary) noted the correction.

Clara Krug (CLASS) noted the minutes for the Faculty Welfare Committee commented about the difficulties the committee has at times encountered trying to interpret the precise wishes of the Senate when it is charged with various duties. She wondered if it would be helpful if the person



or representative of the Senate who made the request attended at least the initial meeting of the Faculty Welfare Committee to clarify any questions.

David Dudley (CLASS, chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee) said the Welfare Committee welcomes any suggestions or means by which the wishes of the SEC can be clarified for the committee and noted that the remarks in his committee's minutes were in particular reference to the harassment issue, which has caused time-consuming difficulty. They sometimes have the impression that the Senate has an idea that something should be done about a particular issue and the Senate says, "Welfare Committee, we'd like you to address this issue. We'd like you to do something about it." But the committee is not precisely sure what it is they're supposed to do about it, except take it under consideration. Mark Edwards (COST) asked if they were having trouble understanding what the Senate wants them to do or what the Senate Executive Committee wants them to do. Dudley felt he could not answer that question. The motion to approve the Librarian's Report was approved.

**a. Undergraduate Committee Minutes (No report submitted to Librarian)**

Constance Campbell (COBA, Co-Chair of Undergraduate Committee) thanked the Deans' offices for making the proposed Curriculum Form more easily read and completed. Since this time of year reduces the day-to-day curriculum issue load, the committee has been working on "strategic" issues, particularly re: General Education Outcomes, and will discuss these issues at the next Senate meeting. She also expressed deep appreciation for the committee's support people, especially Mike Deal and Faye Bacon.

**b. Graduate Committee Minutes (March 12, 2003): Update on proposed changes to Graduate Faculty Status:**

Committee Chair Jerry Wilson (COBA) was in class; Carol Cornwell (CHHS) thought that revisions of Graduate Faculty status were to be discussed, but David Allen (CLASS, Senate Moderator) noted those revisions had been posted for review on the Senate web site and would be for discussion and potential decision at the June Senate meeting.

**4. President's Report:**

President Bruce Grube hoped the legislature would not go into special session because if they passed things as they stood we would have no further cuts; however, everything was still wholly fluid so he had no solid information to pass on. He then thanked the Senate, Lorne Wolfe, and Ray Chandler for their input on the Parking and Transportation Plan that had been revised and distributed, and he thanked (and commiserated with) Joe Franklin for undergoing the process of gathering that input.

**5. Report from David Allen, Chair, Senate Executive Committee**

Allen began by praising a number of environment conservation proposals that President Grube introduced into the Parking and Transportation Master Plan as the result of Senate and open

forum input. He then moved to non-agenda items:

- The SEC endorsed extending the tenure of Richard Rogers as NCAA representative; he is expected to be elected President of the Southern Conference.
- Richard Flynn (CLASS) submitted a motion to move the drop date closer to mid-term; this has been forwarded to the Academic Standards Committee and will likely come to the floor in June.
- Jill Lockwood, chair of the Task Force on Shared Governance formed in Fall '01, would be reporting, after which the Task Force would be discharged and its recommendations passed to Faculty Welfare for consideration and, Allen hoped, brought to the floor in June. Dudley (CLASS), chair of that committee, listed several good reasons that Allen was being overly optimistic re: a June consummation. Clara Krug (CLASS), a member of the Task Force, noted they had met with the Provost and found that the *Faculty Handbook* was already in press, so any approved recommendations couldn't go in this year anyway, except on the web. Allen noted June would be a busy meeting anyway and urged Senators to attend (or nail down alternates) so we would have a quorum.

**a. Nominations and Election of New Officers (Librarian and Secretary)**

Allen noted that Richard Flynn (CLASS) had volunteered to continue as Librarian; with no other nominees, Allen made the motion, it was seconded, and the vote re-elected Flynn as Librarian. As for the position of Secretary, no nominations had come forward, and none came forward at this point, either. Krug (CLASS) moved that the election be moved to later in the agenda; seconded and approved.

**6. Report from Mike Mills, SPC Representative**

Mike Mills (CLASS) noted Martha Abell and Sam Baker were rotating off of the committee after years of valiant service. The faculty election by electric ballot to replace them was in progress, with the eight nominated candidates, their biographies and personal statements in support of their candidacies be posted in conjunction with the electronic ballot. The Strategic Planning Council submitted a list of possible topics for the Quality Enhancement Plan or QEP that they believed met the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools or SACS definition of a QEP proposal: 1) Educating our diverse student body; 2) Creating an engaged university; 3) Creating a community of scholar citizens; 4) Improving graduation rates; and 5) Fostering a culture of high achievement, high expectations, and personal responsibility. The SACS Leadership Team would meet to decide a final topic. Finally, the SPC would meet with the President's Cabinet to discuss options for a new system of evaluation of all levels of the strategic plan to keep it current with changes to the University, updated to reflect progress in plan implementation, and involve the entire campus in an annual process of review.

Dr. David Allen (CLASS, Senate Moderator): Any questions for Mike? Okay. Next up on the agenda is the apportionment proposal. Before we do that, can we come back to the election? I am ready to nominate someone.

At this point Krug (CLASS) nominated Jeanette Rice of COST for Secretary; seconded, and Rice was elected.

## 7. Apportionment Proposals from Jim LoBue, Senate Elections Committee

LoBue (COST) decided to move the individual sections of the proposal separately rather than make an omnibus motion. First up: **“Each college and the Library will have the total number of its full-faculty (including temporary faculty) members divided by 15; for every 15 members, or a major portion thereof that unit will receive a Senate seat to be filled by election following each unit’s election process.”**

Cyr, (CLASS, Senate Secretary), who sat on the Elections Committee, noted this self-adjusting system had been worked out using the number of 663 total faculty (from the Provost’s office), which would produce 45 Senate seats. In a recent meeting, Provost Vandegrift had projected 625-630 for Fall ‘03, which would give about 42 seats. Cyr pointed out that only a precipitate drop in faculty numbers would create a problem – we must have by Statute at least 40 seats – and asked the Provost if he foresaw such a problem coming up. Because of budget and accompanying hiring issues, Provost Vandegrift would hazard no guess.

John Brown (COBA) pointed out that the issue of each unit having 2 seats minimum needed to be rolled into the current motion. LoBue (COST) modified his motion, adding **“No unit shall have fewer than two senate seats, even if that means apportioning a seat to a unit that is not strictly called for by the ration in section 1 of this motion.”** The revised motion was passed.

LoBue’s next motion: **“Apportionment calculations will be conducted by the Senate Elections Committee annually in January using the regular full-time faculty count available from the Provost. That committee will report their findings to the Senate Executive Committee, which will notify the election committees of the individual units regarding those findings and how many seats they have open for election.”** Seconded. Mark Edwards (COST) suggested a more specific census date than “January.” LoBue (COST) and Cyr (CLASS) noted how holidays and other calendar issues made greater specificity problematic.

Chuck Johnson (COBA) asked for a definition of “regular faculty.” LoBue responded that his understanding was that full-time tenured, tenure-track, and temporary faculty were included, but not adjuncts. Johnson suggested adding a definition; Krug (CLASS) suggested the same phrasing as in the first motion passed. Allen (CLASS, Senate Moderator) cited the *Statutes*, Section 8, A: “Voting members of the Faculty Senate shall include at least forty regular full-time members of the faculty of Georgia Southern University holding the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor who have been members of the faculty of the University for at least one year at the beginnings of their terms. . . .” Johnson was still hazy on “regular”; Cyr (CLASS) suggested it excluded adjuncts to avoid the issue of adding up three or four part-time lines to make a Frankensteinian FTE faculty member, and that he felt Krug’s suggestion would work. Johnson accepted substituting “full-time faculty, including temporary faculty members” for “regular faculty.” Parliamentarian Jeff McLellan pointed out that omitting “regular” conflicted with the *Statutes*. Much parliamentary-process confusion ensued.

Ultimately, all motions to this point were amended to use the phrase “regular full-time faculty as defined in the *Statutes*” and the amended motions were passed.

LoBue made his next motion: **“Should apportionment calculations direct a reduction in a unit’s number of senate seats, no sitting senator will be removed; that seat will be eliminated when the first senator of that unit to reach his or her term limit rotates off the senate. Also, no unit will lose more than one seat in any given year, the SEC being charged with the adjusting the terms of elected senators so that staggered term rotation of senators in a unit will not be jeopardized.”** Seconded and approved.

#### **8. Domestic Partners Proposals from David Dudley, Faculty Welfare Committee**

Dudley (CLASS) referred to the agenda attachment titled “Recommendation to the Board of Regents Regarding Domestic Partnership Benefits” and moved that the Faculty Senate adopt this recommendation and that it be sent to the Board of Regents by President Grube under cover of a letter of his own. Seconded. President Grube noted that transmittal would be to the Chancellor, not directly to the Board. The motion passed.

#### **9. Report and Recommendation from Karen McCurdy, Faculty Research Committee: On Grant Competitions**

McCurdy (CLASS) noted problems that led to these recommendations: Two separate competitions – Grant and Stipend – created a situation where the Stipend part had no actual budget in Spring, yet was allocating \$60-75,000. Hence, in Summer ‘02 they consolidated the two into one Grant competition for the Fall, and one for Spring. This has led to faculty comment and administrative difficulties. Also, in Spring ‘02 the committee concluded the timing of the competitions was geared to the quarter system and no longer worked well. Gathering information from the University community via meetings and forums, and checking the fiscal responsibility of their proposals with Graduate School Acting Dean Charlie Hardy and the Provost, they prepared the proposed guidelines now before the Senate. She moved they be approved; seconded.

Cyr (CLASS) asked how this would affect longitudinal studies. McCurdy pointed out that provisions were made on page 6 for this, but no perpetual funding; usually, once would not receive funding two years running, but even unusual circumstances would have 5 year maximum support.

Allen (CLASS, Senate Moderator) asked about faculty response to the consolidation of the competitions, especially re: how this consolidation affected those looking for funding elsewhere when those grants ran on a different schedule.

McCurdy noted the past method had three competitions: One in Fall for grants; one in Spring for grants; one in Spring for stipends. Even consolidating the two Spring competitions into one did not affect the fact that the Spring competition allocated 72%-90% of available funds, so the Fall

competition affects very few people. In effect, Spring was the only substantial competition, hence the proposal to make the *de facto* situation *de jure* and have one competition per year only. Still, a number of faculty had voiced concern on this issue. She also noted that this does not address the confusion and uncertainty involved in allocating funds in Spring without knowing for sure what funds actually will be available in Fall.

Mark Edwards (COST) asked if the new proposal barred temporary faculty from funding. McCurdy answered yes. Edwards was concerned this would negatively impact temporaries with hopes of becoming tenure-track. McCurdy noted the committee's difficulties with unclear guidelines re: elements affecting grant proposal evaluation, such as comparing across disciplines and weight to be given level of seniority. For clarity's sake, and to support those unambiguously part of the Georgia Southern research faculty, temporaries were excluded. She noted the Senate could amend this, though.

Krug (CLASS) noted examples of temporaries who moved into tenure-track positions and, because of time served counting into their tenure schedule, were hard-pressed to produce the scholarship typically required for tenure. However, she also acknowledged that temporaries given funding might take that funding if they move to another institution. LoBue (COST) pointed out there was no guarantee a tenure-track person would not also move; also, temporaries can receive funding anyway, for travel and via reimbursement for earning course credits even at another school. He supported including temporaries in the competition. Edwards (COST) noted we often hire a temporary hoping a tenure-track line will open soon; including temporaries in the grants competition is a way to nurture such people. President Grube reminded the Senate to beware creating expectations for temporaries that may conflict with our overriding commitment to thorough and fair job searches.

Allen (CLASS, Senate Moderator) noted that as well as temporary status, seniority was also an issue of faculty concern in the new proposal, and cited page 7: "Proposals by faculty with less than five years service at GSU or who have not received funding from the Faculty Research Committee will be given a higher priority in funding compared to proposals of an equal quality by faculty who have received prior funding." He further noted that page 8 lists and defines five evaluative categories: excellent, very good, good, fair, poor. He then asked if X number of proposals are judged "excellent" and some come from junior and some from senior faculty, are all those proposals considered of equal merit? McCurdy answered that many distinctions between proposals are mighty fine indeed and that "... the question is, how do we distinguish then between someone who writes a very excellent proposal who's been receiving funding from the committee regularly versus someone who is brand new, and is making some rookie mistakes in, in proposals and do we, how do we break the tie?"

Allen asked if the language on page 6 re: not supporting a single project on a continuing basis did not already address that problem. McCurdy answered that the committee deliberately built in redundancy to offer clear guidelines to the rotating constituency of the committee and hence enhance consistency from year to year. She also affirmed that all proposals in a given category are considered of equal merit no matter what the proposer's seniority.

An unidentifiable voice noted the conundrum that exterior funding is hard to come by in many

areas, and it would be a pity to penalize senior faculty re: this on-campus source; yet it is in Georgia Southern's interest to have a reputation for moving faculty toward tenure and promotion.

Krug (CLASS) noted some seemingly contradictory passages: On page: "Research Grants provide support for early stage scholarship leading to faculty growth and development, middle and late stage scholarship leading to the dissemination of ideas . . ." etc. On page 6: "Faculty who have received a faculty research award during the previous three funding cycles are unlikely to be funded," which still lets anyone at any stage of his or her career be eligible, but lets him or her know be careful about going back to the source too many times. On page 7: "Proposals by faculty with less than five years service at GSU or who have not received funding from the faculty research committee" will be given a higher priority. Krug proposed cutting the "less than five years" language and consistently using "faculty who have not received funding from the faculty research committee in the past three years will be given a higher priority" since that automatically gives a priority to first, second, and third year faculty.

Cyr (CLASS) supported Krug's proposal, partly because McCurdy had made remarks that suggested that seniority, or lack thereof, would not be just a tiebreaker between proposals of equal merit; she appeared to have said that "rookie mistakes" in a junior faculty member's proposal would not prevent that proposal from being ranked as equal to a better prepared, better presented proposal from a senior faculty member.

Provost Vandegrift suggested that proposal forms require an explanation of what the investigator has accomplished with past funding; this might give a rookie a leg up. McCurdy noted that such a section is part of the new proposal. She also said that there is much deliberate ambiguity in the language to give the committee clarity yet flexibility re: decisions made in years when good proposals outstrip funding, and years when funding outstrips the number of proposals judged worthy of support.

Cyr questioned the wisdom of revising the motion's language on the fly, and moved it be tabled so the committee could put in revisions in a coherent fashion. Seconded and approved; the motion was tabled.

#### **10. Request to Establish Ad-hoc Committee on Faculty and Chair Searches from Marc Cyr**

Cyr (CLASS) explained that the motion had grown out of a query he had sent to the Senate listserv asking merely for facts re: the search and hiring practices in other colleges, i.e. whether they were the same as those in CLASS. Along with the asked-for information, he received a number unsolicited and generally angry commentaries about hiring policies and practices in several colleges, not just CLASS. At a CLASS caucus meeting. The following motion was formulated and Cyr had submitted it: "That the Senate appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate current policies and procedures for faculty and chair searches to ensure the existence of, or in their absence, to formulate clear and consistent policies and procedures that are organized, conducted, and concluded by faculty." Seconded. No discussion ensued; the motion

was approved.

## **11. Report and Recommendations from Jill Lockwood, Senate Task Force on Shared Governance**

Lockwood (COBA) noted the report is posted on the web. She emphasized that it was not the intent of the Task Force to challenge the authority of the Board of Regents. So what we are asking for has nothing to do with challenging the legislative authority of the Board of Regents, nor to challenge federal policies with respect to hiring, nor to challenge the authority of any dean or any chair. What the recommendations seek is a role for the faculty with respect to, and not limited to, hiring, annual evaluation, pre-tenure review, post-tenure review, promotion, evaluation, establishment of committees, and evaluation of administrators.

- 1) To the extent that there are policies with respect to any of these items, they would like these policies to be 1) in writing, 2) readily available to the faculty. Faculty should not have to go and ask for a college policy on post-tenure review or promotion and tenure and be asked, “Why do you want it and what are going to do with it?” Such policies ought to be just as available as the faculty directory.
- 2) The written documents would ensure not only 1) compliance with University policies, Board of Regents’ policies, but also 2) that these policies are being maintained consistently in a unit. There is no intent to say any unit must do it this way or that way. It is for that unit to decide. For example, in the College of Business, there are no policies in individual departments. The departments follow the *Bylaws* established by the college. But many departments have written policies and they’ve never been really looked at recently to determine whether they are still in compliance with the University policies that have been passed in the last couple of years. It is incumbent upon the administrators within any unit that has departmental policies to review them. However, the Task Force advocates an open dialogue and a role for faculty re: formulating such policies.

Steve Jenkins (COE, member of the Task Force) noted the Task Force had pursued two sets of data: an inventory of governance-related documents by department and by college, and a survey to get faculty perceptions of shared governance. Lockwood (COBA) noted they had met with the Provost and suggestions from that meeting would be forwarded to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Cyr (CLASS) wondered why the Task Force had not looked at documents from the College of Health and Human Services. Lockwood said the CHHS member of the Task Force attended only one meeting, and they relied on unit representatives to gather documents. Lockwood had, however, personally gone to CHHS to gather the surveys; hence, the Task Force recommendations are still valid. She noted other problems re: document collection: In one unit, it was like “asking to look in their sock drawer.” In another, when one copy was lost, they were told they couldn’t have another. She suggested faculty should not have to beg for copies of policies by which they are judged.

Allen (CLASS, Senate Moderator) moved the Task Force be thanked for its fine work and discharged; seconded and approved. The recommendations will be forwarded to the Faculty Welfare Committee for consideration.

## **12. Report from Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative**

Richard Rogers (CLASS) reported that our women's track team took second in the Southern Conference outdoor championships, which is quite an accomplishment for a team as young as they are. Their coach, Todd Lane, was named Southern Conference Coach of the Year for that sport. Our golf team won the Southern Conference Championship. That means they will also play in the NCAA regional tournament, which they've done the last two years and advanced from there to the NCAA final tournament where they competed against the other 29 best golf teams in the country. Interestingly, the female scholar-athlete of the year as chosen by the University Athletics Committee is a member of the track team, Jackie Allen, and the male scholar-athlete of the year is a member of the golf team, Travis Mobley.

In terms of NCAA legislation: Right now, NCAA money can reach student athletes as a direct benefit for some medical expenses, dental, vision, even small amounts of clothing if they show need. If they are eligible for a Pell Grant, that's called the Special Assistance Fund. This year the NCAA has passed legislation that will make similar funding of available to all student-athletes, regardless of need. The money is to be administered by the Conferences. The NCAA has restricted certain things; it can't be a stipend, you can't just give them money, can't duplicate things in a grant-in-aid, like books. However, what we are looking at is helping fund insurance for the student-athletes, and maybe upgrading transportation in the interest of safety. They passed legislation to change off-season and pre-season structure for football. This came out of some deaths during summer conditioning and pre-season football practices over the last few years, so we've placed some restrictions on that. Finally, for initial eligibility for a prospective student athlete to be eligible to compete in intercollegiate athletics they have to submit a certain GPA and certain SAT scores or ACT scores. That GPA has to be based on a certain number of academic core courses. No shop, PE, band. It has to be English, Math, and so on. And the NCAA has just increased the number of core courses to be used in that calculation from 14 courses to 16. It will take a few years for that to phase in.

## **13. Old Business**

None.

## **14. New Business**

None.

## **15. Announcements: Vice Presidents**

Provost Vandegrift introduced Diana Cone (CHHS) to speak re: the Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force. They had developed four different instruments to gather data from the faculty, the chairs, and the deans. They will have the information over the summer, so that by fall they hope



to have a report to make.

Provost Vandegrift distributed an information item re: placing into the *Handbook* information regarding procedures that are extant for appeals at the University. It was not necessary for it to go to the Faculty Welfare Committee since it deals with existing procedures. He then announced that we have hired a new Director of the Botanical Gardens, Susan Bird Brogdon. She joins us from the Tucson Botanical Gardens. She also had more than twenty years at the Chicago Botanic Garden. Finally, he announced that the line of march for commencement was not yet available, but would soon be available on the Provost's web

**16. Announcements from the Floor**

None.

**17. Adjournment**

Respectfully submitted June 10, 2003, by Marc Cyr, Senate Secretary

# **GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**

## **Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

**June 25, 2003**

### **CE Multipurpose Room #1603**

---

Senators (or Alternates) in Attendance: Martha Abell, Sharon Barrs, John Brown, Constance Campbell, (Tomasz Warchol substituting for Phyllis Dallas), Cordelia Douzenis Zinskie, David Dudley, (Don Armel substituting for Mark Edwards), Bob Fernekes, Chris Geyerman, Alice Hall, Clara Krug, (Carol Nessmith for Susie Lanier), Bill Levernier, Jim LoBue, Karen Mc Curdy, Mary Marwitz, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Jeanette Rice, (Fred Smith substituting for Debra Skinner), David Stone, (Ming Fang He substituting for Deborah Thomas), Jerry Wilson.

Senators Absent: Ruth Carroll, Diana Cone, Carol Cornwell, Gary Dartt, Elizabeth Downs, John Dyer, Mary Hadley, Steve Jenkins, Karl Manrodt, Ann Pratt, Jim Stephens, Stuart Tedders, Matthew Williamson.

Senate Officers in Attendance: David Allen, Marc Cyr, Richard Flynn, Richard Rogers, Marilyn Bruce

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Vaughn Vandegrift, Linda Bleicken, Kate Conway-Turner, Jim Bradford.

Visitors: Kathleen Comerford (CLASS), Lisa Spence (IT Services), Bob Haney (Provost's Office), Marcia Jones (Institutional Compliance), Jim McMillan (CHHS), Dick Diebolt (Graduate Studies), Cindi Chance (COE), Larry Mutter (CHHS).

**Most of the tape between Agenda Item #1 and Agenda Item #11 was inaudible due to a malfunction of the recording equipment. Thereafter, gaps are present but less frequent.**

**1. Approval of the Agenda for the June 25, 2003, Meeting.**

Moved, seconded, approved.

**2. Approval of the April 24, 2003, Minutes: Marc Cyr, Senate Secretary**

Moved, seconded, approved.

**3. Librarian's Report for the June 25, 2003, Senate Meeting: Richard Flynn, Senate Librarian**

Moved, seconded, approved.

**a. Undergraduate Committee Minutes: Report from Undergraduate Committee Co-Chair, Constance Campbell:**

Campbell noted that several Undergraduate Committee items were upcoming on the agenda.

David Stone (COST) noted that two courses approved by the Undergraduate Committee – MSED

## **Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

**June 25, 2003**

**Page 2 of 8**

5530/5530G and MSED 5531/5531G – virtually duplicate courses already taught in the Math department. Campbell noted the committee's new form asks for verification that a new course does not duplicate a course already taught in the college; Provost Vandegrift added that the Deans' Council has an "understanding" that courses that replicate courses in other colleges will be discussed. He said he would alert the deans, and Campbell noted the Undergraduate Committee would look at the courses in question again.

### **b. Graduate Committee Minutes: Report from Graduate Committee Chair, Jerry Wilson**

Wilson (COBA) noted the main committee business would be in an item upcoming on the agenda.

### **4. President's Report: President Bruce Grube**

*Secretary's Note: The transcript for this portion of the meeting reads in total, "inaudible, cannot hear anything." My own notes read, verbatim, "might be Spec Session of Leg – may [underlined twice] get 3% raise next [underlined once] year."*

### **5. Report from David Allen, Chair, Senate Executive Committee**

Allen (CLASS) reviewed items upcoming on this day's agenda. Along with these he noted that Phyllis Dallas's query re: appointing an acting chair for Undergraduate Committee meetings was discussed by the SEC, who felt this was within the purview of the committee's chair. He also noted that, pursuant to the SEC's discussions with the chairs of all committees – discussions which covered such items as membership rotation, continuity of operations, institutional memory, delegating responsibility widely, and leadership -- each committee is directed to prepare a printed orientation packet for incoming members and to hold an individual committee orientation. He also noted that the recommendation by Phyllis Dallas (CLASS) that committee documents be collected in a centralized repository (likely the library) is being pursued. The SEC also decided to direct funding committees to make certain they give feedback on proposals, especially those that go unfunded. Another longstanding issue came up: senatorial absenteeism. The SEC discussed formal procedures, but decided rather that senators with a clear pattern of absences will be addressed in writing by the chair of the SEC. Allen further noted that the SEC had met to fill standing committee vacancies and the Ad-Hoc Committee on University Searches, and that we're looking for a Senate representative to the SGA.

### **6. Report from Mike Mills, SPC Representative**

Martha Abell (COST) spoke for the absent Mills; the SPC had not met since the last Senate meeting so there was no report.

### **7. Report from Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative**

Rogers (CLASS) noted that men's tennis team member Uli Ebensperger was an Academic All-American, graduating with a 4.0 in International Business; and women's track and field team member Jacqueline Allen was Academic All-District, graduating with a 3.8 in Political Science.

**8. Richard Flynn's Motion to Change Drop Date**

Flynn (CLASS) noted that his motion was the result of a recommendation by the Academic Standards Committee. He moved that the last day to withdraw without academic penalty be moved to three or four days (depending on day of the week) after literal mid-term, moving the date to about ten days later than currently. Seconded and approved.

**9. Jim LoBue's Motion to Amend the *Bylaws* (Apportionment and Census Taking))**

Pursuant to the 4/24/03 Senate approval in principle of new Senate apportionment and faculty census procedures, LoBue presented to the Senate the formal changes to the by-laws required to put those procedures into effect. Seconded and approved.

**10. Phyllis Dallas's Motion to Address Appointing Alternates to the Undergraduate Committee**

Dallas (CLASS) moved that a pool of Senate alternates be created for the Undergraduate Committee because, given the critical time factor for their work, they need to assure a quorum be present for each meeting. Seconded.

Stone (COST) noted the same issue had arisen re: the Graduate Committee when scheduling conflicts did not allow him to attend and represent his college. He noted the SEC had dismissed his motion. Cyr (CLASS) remembered that the value of a last minute stand-in's knowledge of business before the committee had been the deciding factor then; the critical issue of quorum had been overlooked until now, at least by Cyr.

Flynn noted that not only absent senators, but absent elected faculty members was a factor to be considered. He offered an amendment to the motion to create an alternate pool that covered both groups. The amendment was seconded and approved.

The amended motion was approved. The Senate Elections Committee will be charged with devising a system for a pool of alternates for committee work.

**11. Motion to Alter Graduate Faculty Status Procedure**

Jim McMillan (CHHS), who chaired the responsible subcommittee, is not on the Senate, so Jerry Wilson (COBA) moved acceptance of a new process for obtaining and renewing Graduate Faculty Status, and of new categories: Member (for tenure-track and tenured faculty) and Affiliate (temporary, adjunct, etcetera). Seconded.

Cyr (CLASS) said several people had raised concerns to him. While the proposal made the process more rational and streamlined, it remained cumbersome to little purpose: The University-wide criteria for Member and Affiliate create pretty much automatic status for anyone with a terminal degree; hence, there's no real "nomination" at all. Also, the nomination form requires a five-signature paper trail, and the renewal process requires yet more bureaucracy even though only documented deficiencies will prevent pretty much automatic renewal.

## Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

June 25, 2003

Page 4 of 8

Senate guest McMillan argued that there was little work involved in the new process, hence it was not cumbersome, and it provided documentation for the individual's vita that the faculty and administration find this person able to participate in the graduate program. Karen McCurdy (CLASS), who just went through the currently required hideous slog to apply for graduate faculty status, concurred that the new proposal eliminates most of the burden.

Senate guest Larry Mutter (CHHS) noted that he and Senate Moderator David Allen (CLASS) had originated the review that led to this proposal. He felt much of the paperwork had been simplified, but pointed out that it includes even more layers of endorsements than the current system. He proposed following the University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill model: If you have a terminal degree when appointed, you get automatic graduate faculty status. The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies at UNC-CH told him "the old process was onerous and now things work like a charm."

Mutter handed Cyr two possible amendments, which Cyr modified and proposed as an omnibus amendment: Eliminate the first paragraph as unnecessary clutter; delete everything beginning with the "Note" on page 2 (because it allows departments and colleges to define a University-level status) through the renewal process; add language about negative post-tenure reviews possibly leading to revocation of status.

Jeanette Rice (COST) was concerned about violation of privacy re: reporting negative reviews to a committee. Wilson noted such reports would go to the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies, not to the Graduate Committee. Flynn (CLASS) found this problematic, believing the faculty committee should vote on whether or not to revoke status. He also asked whether current graduate faculty would have to reapply, since there was no grandfathering clause in the document. McMillan said grandfathering was intended; Flynn said it needed to be in the document. Cyr noted also that successful promotion applications eliminate that period's post-tenure review for an individual, and the process needed to take that into consideration.

Jim LoBue (COST) pointed out that we were now at a stage where we had two separate issues – how we grant graduate faculty status, and how we rescind it – and suggested two motions, not one. McMillan pointed out that what we were talking about would require changes to the language of the *Faculty Handbook*. Cyr opined that we were revising official language on-the-fly, and suggested any suggested changes be taken back to committee for coherent writing.

Clara Krug (CLASS) suggested we needed to settle on some clear directions to give the Graduate Committee or they wouldn't have a clear idea of the Senate's wishes; David Stone (COST) agreed, noting he couldn't even tell whether the Senate wanted further process simplification or not. He added that he himself did not favor more simplification because ". . . what's the point of having a graduate faculty if everybody's on it?"

Senate guest Kathleen Comerford commented that she thought this discussion was about how graduate faculty status was gained, so she could not see how the subject of how such status could be revoked had come up. Cyr noted that, unless uselessly automatic, the system for status renewal would have to have non-renewal as an option; he apologized for using "rescinding" and "revoking" rather than "non-renewal."

## **Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

**June 25, 2003**

**Page 5 of 8**

As if things weren't confused enough, there followed a daisy-chain of motions to amend amendments. Krug suggested that taking elements of the proposal individually would help. Cyr withdrew his original omnibus motion.

He then moved that the first paragraph be struck as useless clutter. Seconded. John Brown (COBA) said the paragraph was consistent with what the Graduate Faculty should be. The motion was defeated.

Cyr then moved that all language from the "Note" on page 2 to the end of the document be deleted. Seconded. McCurdy (CLASS) opposed the amendment because it would leave the current "awful" application process in place. Ming Fang He (COE) opposed the amendment because some kind of required process gives junior faculty a goal to work toward, and standards that need to be achieved make Graduate Faculty status an honor. Flynn argued that process was needed to provide a means by which a faculty member going elsewhere can produce a document proving he or she earned graduate faculty status at Georgia Southern. Guest Mutter suggested no cumbersome process was needed to produce such a letter.

Cyr asked for an example of who, under this proposed "nomination" procedure, would not receive graduate faculty status. It seemed to him that the definitions of Member and Affiliate were a checklist, that one either did nor did not meet the criteria, hence there is not a real "nomination." Wilson (COBA) said that the proposal means the Graduate Committee won't be the policeman that turns people down; individual units will establish criteria that say who can and cannot chair thesis and dissertation committees. Cyr opined that units had that discretion via the Member and Affiliate definitions already since they made faculty only "eligible" to serve in these positions, but left allowing them that role to the unit. Wilson felt the page 2 "Note" was needed because then units could add other criteria before "eligible" would actually mean "allowed to." Cyr's motion was defeated.

This brought us back to the original motion to accept the whole Graduate Committee proposal without amendment. Brown (COBA) opined that the nomination procedure seemed "a little involved" and asked why some of the signature lines on the form say the signatory "approves," and others say the signatory "endorses"; he noted the terms are not synonyms. Guest McMillan noted "approved" was reserved for faculty representative signatories; the "endorsed" lines merely note the person has seen the paperwork and passed it on.

Flynn (CLASS), a member of the sub-committee that wrote the proposal, nevertheless moved that all language from "appointment period" on be deleted. Seconded. Echoing earlier comments by Cyr, he noted that negative pre-tenure and tenure reviews result in a faculty member leaving, so graduate faculty status reviews at those times are moot, and review periods need to take promotions into account. He added that a grandfathering clause is needed. His motion for amendment was approved.

Krug moved that a grandfather clause be added. Seconded and approved.

Cyr moved that the document be tabled so the committee could coherently work out the revisions. Seconded and approved; the original motion was tabled.

**12. David Dudley's Motion to Approve Statement on Harassing and Threatening Behavior**

Dudley (CLASS, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee) said the statement's purpose was not to define harassing or threatening behavior, but to let people on campus know that, under such distress, they have recourse via the resources listed in the statement. He noted that appended was a list of venues for the widest possible dissemination of the information. He moved that the Senate approve the statement and its wide distribution. Seconded.

Senate guest Marcia Jones of the Office of Institutional Compliance questioned the Senate's prerogative to promulgate a policy that impacts the whole campus, including students. She also noted that the list of resources left out the Division of Human Resources.

Flynn (CLASS) asked for a definition of "harassing and threatening behavior" since the document left it as "something perceived by a potential victim." Flynn found it "troublesome to have a policy on something that you don't define." Dudley replied that such definitions were available at sites listed in the statement; he felt "perception" was appropriate so someone wouldn't perhaps dangerously hesitate before seeking counsel, and noted that such counsel might well reveal that no threat or harassment existed.

Cyr (CLASS) noted that definitions of various kinds of harassment are extant, but not "threat," and it was the phrase "perceived level of threat," excluding harassment, that the statement used as the index for prompting action and for which resource a person should turn to. As an example of such perception difficulty, he noted an instance of someone in his own department complaining about his use in a memo of "violent" language; he noted his language had been a slight paraphrase of that noted avatar of violence, Jesus Christ.

Dudley noted the impetus for the charge to his committee had been a threat made against a person, something like "If I go down, I'm taking you down with me."

Guest Jones suggested some slight modifications of definitions on the Institutional Compliance website could well obviate the perceived need for this statement. She further noted that each site on the list of potential venues for distribution already contains current harassment policies, with the exception of the Faculty/Staff Directory, and she questioned the appropriateness of that last venue for this mission. Krug (CLASS) argued the statement and its distribution were still needed to direct people to these resources.

Flynn (CLASS) suggested putting institutional definitions of harassment in the preamble leading to the list of resources; without such definitions, he felt a "can of worms" was being opened. Guest Jones offered to include a broader definition in her office's published material, and again questioned the Senate's purview in this arena.

President Grube noted that in this area we are dealing with federal and state statutes, and hence are on tricky ground re: institutional language. He further noted that First Amendment and Freedom of Speech issues are involved.

Dudley noted his frustration, that he and the Welfare Committee had worked a whole year and still didn't know what the SEC and Senate wanted. Cyr (CLASS) suggested that an option for a

## **Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

**June 25, 2003**

**Page 7 of 8**

committee was to recommend, after deliberation, that no action be taken on a particular motion.

Krug noted that she had initiated the charge to the Welfare Committee because the person involved in the perceived threat situation had not known what avenues were open to her. Krug also noted “threat” and “harassment” are defined already by government. President Grube confirmed this, but noted the person in question had been directed to the proper recourse resource but wouldn’t go through the process required by that avenue. Krug had heard a different version of events, and still argued for publication of the statement and its recourse resource list.

Cordelia Douzenis Zinskie (COE), a member of the subcommittee that wrote the statement, backed up Dudley’s plea of frustration and lack of clear Senate direction. She noted the research they had done, the difficulties they ran into, and suggested the document be accepted as is or the task be taken off the committee’s back. Guest Comerford also favored the document, and suggested adding the Counseling Center to the recourse resource list. Rice (COST) also supported the document. The motion was approved.

### **13. Nominations and Election of Senate Parliamentarian**

Jeff McLellan volunteered to continue in this role; his nomination was seconded and approved.

### **14. Old Business**

Karen McCurdy (CLASS and Faculty Research Committee Chair) moved to bring the revised Guidelines for Faculty Research Grants Policy and Guidelines off the table. Seconded.

Cyr (CLASS) and Flynn (CLASS) noted the revisions had been available for only five days and argued this was insufficient time for consideration before discussion; Flynn also noted that five colleagues who could not attend on such short notice still had concerns. Ming Fang He (COE) and Krug (CLASS) also noted initial difficulties with the revised document. The motion to bring the guidelines off the table was defeated.

### **15. New Business**

Jim LoBue (COST) moved the Senate commend David Allen (CLASS) for his efforts as moderator. Seconded. Passed by applause.

### **16. Announcements: Vice Presidents**

Provost Vandegrift noted that concerns about interoperability among e-mail systems led a Lisa Spence-led task force to explore groupware options. As a result, GroupWise will be phased in over the coming year University-wide and will become the only system supported by the University; there will be training sessions to facilitate smooth transition. He suggested any questions be directed at Spence.

Further, basically because of budget issues (lack of endowment), the Bell Honors Program will be phased out and a single University Honors Program enhanced.



## **Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

**June 25, 2003**

**Page 8 of 8**

Provost Vandegrift next discussed faculty searches: Rather than halt searches, a process whereby under almost any circumstances we would not have to abandon searches is being explored. It's a big problem: The deans have requested 105 searches for next year, we have only 60 vacancies with money and permanent lines, and those 60 are not safe against future cuts from the state. They're looking for a prudent number between 0 and 60 and can only hope that this would result in no stoppages. He noted the 105 requests were predicated in part on the economic fact that one of the 60 tenure-track lines, if abandoned, can fund two or three temporaries. He also noted that every dean is fighting tooth and claw for every possible search for his or her college.

He next announced several personnel moves: Diana Cone (CHHS) is now Acting Associate VP for Academic Affairs; Julie Cole is the new Director of Research Services and Sponsored Programs; Karl Vogle has the endowed Karl E. Peace Chair in Biostatistics; Jim Bradford is Dean of the College of Information Technology (CIT); and Annie Morobel-Sosa is Dean of COST.

Next up, COBA's reorganization from 5 to 4 units has been approved. Last, Provost Vandegrift will talk to Dean Mitchell re: the possibility of establishing a repository for Senate Documents in the library.

VP Linda Bleicken (Student Affairs) noted record enrollment this summer of 7,220, up from 6,979 last year. We were currently in session 4 of SOAR, with 322 prospective students per session; the SAT average of already registered incoming freshmen is 1056, so we have a large and good group coming in.

### **17. Announcements from the Floor**

President Grube thanked David Allen (CLASS) and presented him with a plaque commemorating his year of dedicated service as Moderator.

### **18. Adjournment**

Moved, seconded, approved.

*Respectfully submitted by Marc D. Cyr, Faculty Senate Secretary.*

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**September 16, 2003**  
**Russell Union Ballroom**

---

Voting Members in Attendance: Kathy Albertson, David Alley, John Brown, Randy Carlson, Jean Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Robert Cook, Phyllis Dallas, Gary Dartt, Elizabeth Downs, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Robert Fernekes, Chris Geyerman, Mary Hadley, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Clark Krug, Gautam Kundu, Annette Laing, Bill Levernier, Jim LoBue (Kathleen Gruben for Karl Manrodt), Michael Moore, Patrick Novotny, Charisse Perkins, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Debra Skinner, David Stone, Stuart Tedders, Deborah Thomas, Cordelia Douzenis Zinskie.

Voting Members Absent: Sharon Barrs, Reggie Brown, Carol Cornwell, Susie Lanier, Shari Park-Gates

Senate Officers in Attendance: Marc D. Cyr, Jeanette K. Rice, Richard Flynn, Jeff McLellan

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Vaughn Vandegrift, Linda Bleicken, Cindi Chance, Charlie Hardy, James Bradford, Kate Conway-Turner, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Richard Rogers, Michael Mills, Marilyn Bruce, Bede Mitchell

Visitors: Candace Griffin, Provost's Office; Denise Battles, COST Dean's Office; David Allen, Sociology and Anthropology; Don Armel, School of Technology; Teresa Thompson, Student Affairs and Admissions; Bob Haney, Associate Provost; Karen McCurdy, Political Science; Dick Diebolt, College of Graduate Studies, Richard Tichich, CLASS Alternate.

---

**1. Approval of the Agenda for the September 16, 2003, Meeting**

Marc D. Cyr (CLASS, Senate Moderator) moved approval; seconded and approved.

**2. Approval of the June 25, 2003, Minutes**

Jeanette K. Rice (COST, Senate Secretary) moved approval; seconded and approved.

**3. Librarian's Report for September 9, 2003**

Richard Flynn (CLASS, Senate Librarian) moved for approval. Cyr (Moderator) commented that approval of the Librarian's Report is only as to accuracy in reflecting the minutes contained therein. Any committee motions, including curricular changes from the Undergraduate and Graduate committees, will be presented as a separate motion. Motion to approve was seconded, Librarian's Report was approved.

- a. **Undergraduate Committee Minutes** (No report submitted to Librarian - Committee had not yet met.)
- b. **Graduate Committee Minutes** (No report submitted to Librarian - Committee had not yet met.)

#### 4. **President's Report**

President Bruce Grube reported that final enrollment figures were expected to be approximately 15,700 when October's final census was complete, and that SAT scores will be in the range of 1060. A small task force on the Enrollment Management Committee is working on an "SAT 1100 Project" to determine the feasibility of achieving that average SAT score in the next few years. This may have interesting implications as the Chancellor has announced that "dampening down enrollment may be part of the puzzle in dealing with budget issues."

He has been meeting with new faculty, and congratulated those involved for bringing in such a fine group. A key element of the meetings has been assuring new tenure-track faculty that they are not in danger because of budget issues.

On the topic of the budget, the 2.5% that the state wants back out of fiscal '04 is covered, as the University had built in a reserve in anticipation of this. In '05, the 2.5% will be expected, with another 5% added to it. On a slightly positive note, they add the 5% after they have subtracted out the 2.5%, so it's not a true 7.5%. Nonetheless, the University is looking at a roughly \$5 million problem. President Grube is meeting with the Chancellor to discuss how Georgia Southern might deal with budget issues for '05 and a draft plan will be forthcoming. The Chancellor *is* responding to pressure to show that appropriate cuts are being made in the University System of Georgia, and based on reports from state economists, President Grube can not help but think that we will be in a better situation than predicted by late next Spring. It is unlikely that we will make up the full 7.5 or 7.1%, but it could be half of what we are looking at now. While it is necessary to plan for a worst case scenario, panic is not yet called for.

The Chancellor has provided a list of what he called "University System Budget Management Principles". There were no surprises, but to provide a select few:

- "The University System cannot be all things to all people — an institution cannot be all things to all people."
- "Given limited resources it is important to shift resources to instruction, to serve students to create a more educated Georgia." (i.e., you have to protect in-class instruction.)
- "The institutions exist first and foremost to serve students."
- "Direct academic student services as precedence over other institutional services."

The System is investigating measures to contain costs by preventing unnecessary duplication of administrative functions and regional handling of some services. Georgia Southern is working

on its own Budget Management list, which will be available to the campus community as soon as it is ready. Citing the often fatalistic outlook of philosopher Thomas Hobbes, President Grube suggested that at times like these, where it would be easy to let circumstances elicit the worst in us, we instead take the opposite tack and pull together as a team to make the best of a bad situation.

President Grube noted that Associate Provost Bob Haney is the organizing principal behind our upcoming SACS reaffirmation. The University community will be kept apprised as we move toward the March/April 2005 on-site visit. NCAA re-certification of our athletics program is also underway, and is being chaired by Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Linda Bleicken. Finally, he commented on the overwhelming success of A Day for Southern and thanked all who participated for their support.

## **5. Report from Marc D. Cyr, Chair, Senate Executive Committee**

Cyr (Moderator, SEC Chair) welcomed new senators and Michael Moore, who replaces Jim Stephens as the COE SEC representative. The SEC received one agenda item request (which is on the current agenda) and three information requests. He referred the first information request to Dean Charles Hardy of the Graduate College.

(Secretary's Note: an information request was submitted from Annette Laing (CLASS) concerning delays on the part of the College of Graduate Studies in responding to applications for admission to our graduate programs; the inquiry Dr. Hardy refers to is this.)

Charles Hardy (Acting Dean, College of Graduate Studies) thanked Cyr for the invitation to report on the progress of the reorganization of the College of Graduate Studies, particularly improvements in the enrollment services area. This was a concern expressed to him by many when he accepted the position. At that time, there were 15,000 files that either needed to be acted upon or archived. As a means to prevent such a massive task from recurring, he proposed a new model that partnered the College of Graduate Studies with the Office of Admissions. Dr. Teresa Thompson assumed responsibilities as Director of Graduate Admissions. This was a challenging transition, and while they have had a lot of positive feedback recently, this was not always the case. Communication delays may have resulted in students opting to attend other institutions. There was a diligent effort to identify existing problems and act appropriately. He believes they have turned the corner in this respect and is optimistic in light of the improved communication between program directors and applicants.

Addressing the inquiry, Dean Hardy stated that there were 1,441 applicants for Fall '03 admission, the highest number ever. Graduate enrollment was also high in the summer term. There are 1,955 graduate students, just short of the 2,000 goal set as part of the strategic plan to make 20% of the campus population graduate students. Comparison of the Fall '03 data with that from Fall 1998-2002 saw an increase of 27% in the number of applications processed. The acceptance rate increased 21%, and the enrollment ratio was 74% (compared to the five-year

enrollment ratio of 70%.) Dean Hardy proposed that while there were problems in the transition, he does not believe it negatively impacted the overall graduate program. They are taking steps to ensure no reoccurrence of those problems. Increased involvement of technology in the admissions process leads him to believe that it will be entirely electronic by Spring 2004. Dean Hardy reiterated that they are having success in improving the admissions process, and it remains their highest priority. He requested constant input from everyone involved so they may respond immediately to guarantee that not one student is lost. Annette Laing (CLASS) asked for Dean Hardy's personal pledge that we will not be remiss in getting admission letters out in the future, which she received.

Cyr (Moderator) reported on two other information requests received by SEC. The first, from Laing (CLASS), concerned the sale of a t-shirt by the University store. This request was answered in a letter which stated that it is the purview of any individual to lodge a complaint to the store management and seek redress. The second query from Laing (CLASS) concerned administrators teaching to help relieve our budget woes. This was forwarded to President Grube, as he was the administrator named in the request. The short answer received by the SEC is that his schedule is fully booked with administrative work, particularly in our current stressful budget situation. While no other administrative personnel or types of personnel were defined in the query, the SEC thinks the implication is that the same holds true for them.

President Grube stated that the quick answer with respect to him is really very simple: *you don't want me doing that right now*. He believes that the University really needs him to be doing other things that are eating an incredible amount of time. He does hope that he will eventually get to teach, as that would be a wonderful change of pace. However, at this time, he feels it is not in the University's best interest.

Laing (CLASS) expressed her appreciation for President Grube's comments on cooperation and positive thinking, as made during the President's report today, and as she was present when he interviewed, she recalls him saying that he would teach occasionally. She stated that she has known administrators at institutions twice as large as this with fiscal crises that have still taught, and she (and many of her constituents) believe that as faculty are being asked to do more with less, it would be a tremendous boost to morale if they could see some administrators and senior levels from deans on up occasionally setting foot in a classroom so they would know what faculty are up against.

President Grube responded that while he appreciated Laing's comments, if she would please convey back to the people she represents that he has over thirty years of teaching in his background and understands only too well what happens in a classroom, what people are up against, and what that means, so he did not take her question lightly. He reiterated that he was being very serious when he said *you don't want me doing that right now*. However, he postulated that if a symbolic morale boost is more important than going to work on legislators and the Governor and on the budget issues so be it. In that case, the Senate can have a vote about

whether that is where he ought to spend his time and he would be glad to take that into consideration.

Krug (CLASS) requested that we return to the issue of the t-shirt, stating that she did not realize the shirt in question was being sold, and wanted to ensure that everyone knows what the issue is with this particular shirt.

Cyr (Moderator) illuminated the issue for the Senate by quoting the text of the shirt in question: “You can always retake a test, but you can’t relive a party” and stated there was a problem in that apparently some of our students believed you really *could* retake your tests, or that the shirt sent the wrong message as an item that bears the University’s name. The University Store is a part of Auxiliary Services, which is self-supporting, and the shirt sold well which is why they kept it in stock. He reminded the Senate that any individual who would like them to not restock it can go to the store and raise it with them. If appropriate redress is not received, then it may come back to the Senate. An alternate approach would be to make a motion to create some kind of oversight committee, to make sure that the items in the bookstore meet the Senate’s approval. While Cyr (Moderator) was not certain if we want to do that, it would be under new business or an agenda item request in the future.

David Robinson (CLASS) interjected that we also consider an oversight committee to see if we have completely lost our sense of humor.

Cyr (Moderator) noted that would also have to come up under new business. He noted two other points: the ad hoc committee on search and hire procedures will begin work in the very near future. Also, the SPC had approached the SEC about sitting in at their meetings but has decided not to pursue that proposal. He finished with two reminders: if the Senate wants to modify or include something in printed University publications, the deadline is the February meeting, to allow for typesetting, etc., and we must elect our 2004-2005 SEC chair at our November meeting to allow for the necessary six month apprenticeship.

There was a discussion between Jim LoBue (COST, and Chair, Senate Elections Committee) and Cyr (Moderator) as to eligibility for service as SEC chair. Cyr (Moderator) commented that to his knowledge the only criterion was that the individual be a Senator this term to allow time to apprentice. LoBue (COST) added that those currently in their third year of Senate service would not be eligible, but Cyr (Moderator) was less certain of that point, as he is a non-voting member on the Senate (and also non-voting on the SEC), except in the case of a tie, at which point he casts a deciding vote in a senatorial matter. He suggested we might want to look into the language on this.

## **6. Report from Mike Mills, SPC Representative**

Mike Mills (CLASS, SPC Representative) reported that a vote to replace the faculty representative seat on the Strategic Planning Council would be held via electronic ballot in the

very near future. The eight candidates' names, biographies, and personal statements will be posted in conjunction with the electronic ballot. Senators should encourage their faculty to participate in this election. The SPC recently met separately with President Grube and Provost Vandegrift to discuss strategic issues concerning budget, enrollment, the QEP, and SACS re-accreditation. A meeting with Vice President for Student Affairs Linda Bleicken is scheduled for the next week, and is the first in a series of meetings with University vice presidents who will discuss how their units are progressing on implementing the details of the Strategic Plan. These meetings will start a new system of evaluation of all levels of the Strategic Plan to keep it current with the university changes, update it to reflect progress and plan implementation, and involve the entire campus in the annual process review. At an upcoming Senate meeting the SPC will present a detailed description of this process.

Mark Edwards (COST) queried as to when the Level III Strategic Plan will be available and Mills (CLASS) replied that it was currently available on the Academic Affairs web site, and would be linked to the SPC's web site shortly. Provost Vandegrift interjected that it would be linked to Academic Affairs shortly, but was not currently.

Krug (CLASS) wondered if the Level III Strategic Plan that is being implemented had undergone any changes. Mills (CLASS) said the SPC is not directly overseeing anything having to do with Level III plans. Provost Vandegrift clarified that aspects of the Level III plans are being implemented, and cited the newly created College of Information Technology, as well as the addition of an extra position to the Music Program, which was an 'enhanced' program. While all examples were not immediately available, he commented that many things have been going on around campus that are consistent with the Strategic Plan. When the Level III plans are available it will be apparent that some of the points say "accomplished" or "in progress", so we are committed to the planning process and to the program review which was a part of it.

Krug (CLASS) sought confirmation that faculty will be apprised of those changes by consulting the web site when it is up. Provost Vandegrift thought the faculty in those enhanced programs were already apprised as faculty lines were added. Krug (CLASS) was concerned that others who were not in those particular areas who might not have known about the changes, to which Provost Vandegrift opined that if faculty are not aware of what is going on in their college or elsewhere then they could surely consult the web site and see what is in the plan.

## **7. Election of Senate representative on the SGA (SEC nominee is Patrick Novotny)**

Cyr (Moderator) addressed the need to elect the Senate representative to the Student Government Association and noted that the SEC nominee is Patrick Novotny. He called for additional nominations from the floor. Cyr (Moderator) provided that Patrick was asked for by the President of the SGA, and was willing to serve as this would dovetail with other items that he is involved with. He moved for Novotny's nomination; it was seconded and approved.

**8. Proposal from Clara Krug (CLASS) re: Informing Faculty of Last Date to Withdraw Without Academic Penalty**

Krug (CLASS) moved as follows: “That ten days prior to the first day of classes each semester the Office of the Registrar inform faculty in writing of the final date to withdraw from classes without academic penalty during that semester.” The motion was seconded.

Cyr (Moderator) mentioned that Registrar Mike Deal advised that his office could provide this but that Deal also suggested that it might be easier for faculty to go to the Registrar’s web site. Krug’s (CLASS) concern centered around a change in the drop deadline, as approved by the Senate in June. Faculty who are away for the summer often use the web site to identify important dates for inclusion in their syllabi. This past summer the Registrar’s page showed “October 1, last day to withdraw without academic penalty” for quite a while, and faculty who are out of town may not be aware of Senate actions until the Fall, after the semester has already begun. Krug (CLASS) clarified that she requested the advanced notification so that those people would have time to change their syllabi. Flynn (CLASS) felt this would be a one-time occurrence, but Krug (CLASS) thought that since we are supposed to include the drop date on our syllabus it would be good to remind faculty, and it would be more helpful to have it ten days before class rather than one.

Edwards (COST) asked if that place on the web is the official place where they keep these dates and Cyr (Moderator) offered that he believed it to be the official calendar. Edwards (COST) relayed that a student bought a planner from the bookstore that had the old drop date in it so this did cause a little bit more confusion than just having it changed. The student was completely unaware that the drop date was the 14<sup>th</sup>, until she saw Edwards’ syllabus.

Dr. John Brown (COBA) agreed with Flynn (CLASS) that it was a one-time problem, while . LoBue (COST) supported Krug (CLASS) because we are now asked to make reports on freshmen and they have to be done in such a timely manner that the date really is critical. Phyllis Dallas (CLASS) added that she checked the spring 2004 schedule and the drop date is correct, but those schedules are available several semesters ahead of time for people who are involved in scheduling/planning, so until this date is absolutely set there may be misinformation on the web. She believed the Registrar’s web site also has a note saying these dates may not be absolute. Krug (CLASS) read from the Registrar’s page, which confirmed that changes may be made at any time. Dallas (CLASS) supported Krug’s (CLASS) motion because there have been problems with dates for final exams.

Flynn (CLASS) wondered if many important dates, and not just the one, were in question and if the motion should be changed to reflect that. Krug (CLASS) wanted whatever was easiest for faculty and students. Cyr (Moderator) noted that the Registrar already informs faculty of changes or errors in published materials, and that Krug’s (CLASS) motion properly dealt with one key date; Krug (CLASS) agreed that the one date was her concern. Robinson (CLASS) asked if there was incorrect data on the Registrar’s web site, and he and Dallas (CLASS) engaged in a side



conversation on this subject until Cyr (Moderator) called them back to the motion on the floor, at which Robinson (CLASS) noted that if the web site is kept accurate, he saw no need for extra notifications. Cyr (Moderator) called the vote, and the motion was defeated 17-14.

## **9. Report from Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative**

Richard Rogers (NCAA Representative ) distributed and discussed the annual official graduation rates report. The graduation rate for freshman male student athletes, or those that were freshman in 1996-97, is a little low this year, and was affected by a couple of factors. Two men's sports were discontinued after that cohort began: swimming and cross country. Some of those students transferred, and if they transfer in good standing they count against our graduation rate. There were coaching changes in major men's sports, and that can affect the students the previous coach recruited. All other numbers were consistent.

He addressed the topic of re-certification, stating that Georgia Southern has begun its year-long self-study. We have four areas, each with its own subcommittee. Each subcommittee will be gathering data and answering the questions posed by the NCAA. A final report is going to be available for the entire campus to review. He urged anyone with interest in institutional control of athletics to please take the opportunity to review those reports. It does not always satisfy the NCAA just to provide the opportunity for institutional input, as it can upset them if none is received.

## **10. Old Business**

Krug (CLASS) questioned items from the June 2003 Senate meeting as follows:

- What was the follow up to the issue regarding duplicating courses in the Math Department by MSED 5530 and MSED 5531? David Stone (COST) advised that it goes back to the Undergraduate Committee from whence it came. He has been talking with our representative to that council, and also to people in the College of Education, so it is in process. Cyr (Moderator) reminded that this is one reason why the SEC and Jeff McLellan (Senate Parliamentarian) split out and formalized the Librarian's Report so that there is not some kind of omnibus. Curricular changes on the graduate and undergraduate level now come forward as separate items so that they will be open for discussion here. As to whether it would come back to the Senate at some point, Cyr (Moderator) replied that it should and that he believed Provost Vandegrift said that it would be taken back to the Dean's Council. The Provost believes it is pending.
- What is the status of item #10 on the June '03 agenda concerning forming a group of Alternates for the various committees? LoBue (COST and Chair, Elections Committee) answered that the committee had met once but had not had enough of a discussion yet to give a report.

- Will item #11 on the June '03 agenda pertaining to Graduate Faculty Membership be voted off the table or is it still being revised? Cyr (Moderator) referred to Flynn (CLASS) who responded that the committee will meet on Thursday and he believed that item was on the agenda.
- Item #14 on the June '03 agenda concerned the Faculty Research Grant Policy and Guidelines. When can we expect revised guidelines? Cyr (Moderator) referred the question to the new chair of that committee, David Alley (CLASS), who advised that the Faculty Research Committee would meet prior to the Fall application deadline, and that the concerns raised last year will be addressed over the course of this year.
- When will the Policy on Harassment that the Senate passed in June appear in the *Handbook*? Provost Vandegrift asked if the President responded to the Senate's passage of that through endorsement yet, and advised that would be the first necessary step. Cyr (Moderator) offered to check on its status with the President.

Stone (COST) queried the Provost's mention of Groupwise at the last Senate meeting and wondered if this was being accepted by the University. The Provost provided that Groupwise was recommended as the common standard for Groupware on campus. The University currently has six different communication systems that have trouble with interoperability. The President's Cabinet endorsed the concept that there would be one Groupware system and but stopped short of endorsing Groupwise. Nevertheless, that was the one the committee had recommended. The administration decided to take the current generation (version 6.5) to the campus to see if it satisfies their needs. Georgia Southern has an interest as we are a Novell campus, so Groupwise would be provided to us at the current cost to maintain our Novell network. Otherwise, it will be necessary to purchase a program on the open market which is estimated to cost ~\$100,000. Thus, the University has a stake in Groupwise in the sense that it has been recommended by a committee and would accrue a cost savings, but has not yet insisted that it *has* to be Groupwise. The decision will be made after receipt of campus input. Groupwise 6.5 is a newer version than exists on campus, with internet and other web capabilities which may have been an issue with some faculty. This is why the Novell people are on campus to have folks look at the capabilities. It is not a training session, it is a capability session that is being offered.

## **11. New Business**

Laing (CLASS) asked why current *internal* searches to fill three administrative secretary positions and one senior secretary position in the College of Information Technology are being conducted when the consequence will be to leave other departments on campus understaffed given the hiring freeze.

Provost Vandegrift commented that searches are under the sixty day hiring delay; it is not a hiring freeze. He noted that recommendations can be made that those sixty-day waiting

requirements be waived and in every case in which we have had a vacancy of a secretary in a department it was waived.

Laing (CLASS) thought that the Department of History did not get a waiver of the sixty-day requirement; they waited sixty days and then had a full-time position slashed to half-time. However, the main point of her question was why is this being done as an internal search when the effect is going to be that some departments are going to lose administrative staff to fill positions in CIT?

Provost Vandegrift replied that the decision for external vs. internal searches is determined by Marcia Jones, the Institutional Compliance officer, working with HR. Since the CIT is new, doing an internal search might provide people who had experience working at the University. Jim Bradford (Dean, CIT) offered that he was the person that asked for the internal search, as they currently have one secretary for six departments, three new chairs and one new dean. The rationale was that somebody with Georgia Southern experience was needed, and that was most likely to be achieved through an internal search.

## **12. Announcements: Vice Presidents**

Provost Vandegrift deferred to Faculty Senate Representative to the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee, Deborah Thomas. She noted changes in the composition of the committee: Kyle Hancock for Jane Hudak in CLASS; Mary Hazeldine for Ralph Byington in COBA; Cheryl Aasheim joining from CIT, and she is taking over for Diana Cone as a Senate Rep. One of their charges was to characterize faculty roles and identify any disconnection, which led to administration of several data collection instruments. This included a faculty effort allocation form on which chairs and directors indicated the effort distributions (teaching, service, etc.) of their faculty members. Data analysis is ongoing, and a draft report will likely be available mid-Fall. Development of a model for faculty effort assignments is also part of their charge and they expect to make their recommendations by the end of this academic year. Opportunities for faculty discussion and participation will be available.

Provost Vandegrift announced that Charles Hardy has agreed to serve as Acting Dean of the Graduate College for one additional year. The search for a permanent dean will be conducted in the Fall of 2004.

There are sixty-eight to seventy tenure-track positions available in the University. Searches are being conducted for about half of those, and the Provost hopes that none will have to be stopped for budgetary reasons. The remaining lines have been used to hire fifty to fifty-five temporary faculty, which enabled us to address the increased enrollment

The Academic Affairs newsletter is coming out with useful information for faculty. He called attention to Dr. Novotny's (CLASS) piece on the American Democracy Project. Faculty

interested in working specifically on this project should see Dr. Novotny. He noted the upcoming Fall General Faculty Meeting [**rescheduled for October 23, Nessmith-Lane Ballroom**], where the winner of the Eidson Faculty Award for Sustained Career Excellence will be announced.

An on-campus retreat next week will focus on the Deans sharing their Level III goals and objectives for their colleges. Finally, the Provost thanked the faculty for a very smooth start to the semester. He feels the faculty are our most important group and appreciates their efforts to sustain morale in these challenging times.

Cyr (Moderator) sought clarification as to whether the entire Level III plans would be available on the Academic Affairs web site, to which Provost Vandegrift responded that they would not represent the entirety of what was going on within the colleges, and he would expect the Deans to take care of any additional important information

There were no further announcements or reports from vice presidents.

### **13. Announcements from the Floor**

Brown (COBA, President of the Campus Chapter of AAUP) announced that AAUP was hosting Representative Bob Lane and State Senator Jack Hill at 5:00 p.m. the next evening. He stressed the importance of faculty attending to encourage our local representatives to continue to serve us well.

### **14. Adjournment**

Cyr (Moderator) moved for adjournment. It was seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Jeanette K. Rice, Senate Secretary.

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**October 16, 2003**  
**Russell Union Ballroom**

---

Voting Members in Attendance: Kathy Albertson, David Alley, Sharon Barrs, John Brown, Randy Carlson, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Robert Cook, Phyllis Dallas, Gary Dartt, Elizabeth Downs, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Bob Fernekes, Chris Geyerman, Mary Hadley, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Clara Krug, Anne Laing, (Patricia Humphrey for Susie Lanier), Bill Levernier, Jim LoBue, Karl Manrodt, Michael Moore, Patrick Novotny, Charisse Perkins, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, (Sonya Shepherd for Debra Skinner), (David Leo Lickteig for David Stone), Stuart Tedders, Cordelia Douzenis Zinskie

Voting Members Absent: Reggie Brown, Carol Cornwell, Gautam Kundu, Shari Park-Gates, Deborah Thomas

Senate Officers in Attendance: Marc Cyr, Jeanette Rice, Richard Flynn, Jeff McLellan

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Vaughn Vandegrift, Linda Bleicken, Ron Core, Charlie Hardy, James Bradford, Kate Conway-Turner, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Bede Mitchell

NCAA Faculty Athletic Rep: Richard Rogers  
SPC Rep: Michael Mills

Visitors: Denise Battles, Diana Cone, Candy Schille, Marcia Jones, Bob Haney

---

**1. Approval of the Agenda for the October 16, 2003, Meeting**

Marc Cyr (CLASS, Senate Moderator) moved to modify the agenda such that the Vice Presidents' announcements immediately follow the President's report to allow the President, Provost and Vice President Bleicken ample travel time to an out of town meeting. The motion was seconded and the amended agenda approved.

**2. Approval of the [September 16, 2003](#), Minutes**

Jeanette Rice (COST, Senate Secretary) moved approval; seconded and approved.

**3. Librarian's Report of [October 8, 2003](#)**

Richard Flynn (CLASS, Senate Librarian) noted two typographical corrections: in the Academic Standards Committee section, 'faculty' is misspelled, and in the Faculty Welfare Committee section on page two "is scheduled" should be two words. He reminded the senators that

approving the Librarian's Report pertains only to accuracy, not content and moved for its approval. Seconded and approved.

**a. Undergraduate Committee Minutes**

Sharon Barrs (COST, Chair, Undergraduate Committee) reported that the committee met on September 23, 2003 at which time they elected a chair, approved a new operating code, and had orientation for new members.

**b. Graduate Committee Minutes**

Flynn (CLASS, Chair, Graduate Committee) advised that the committee met on September 18, 2003, and that the curriculum items from the June Senate meeting were contained in the current Librarian's report. He moved for their acceptance; the motion was seconded.

Clara Krug (CLASS) queried as to how the re-designation of the Master of Arts in Sociology to the Master of Arts in Social Science with concentrations in Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology, and History fits in with the Master's Degree programs that already exist in Psychology and History?

Charlie Hardy (Acting Dean, College of Graduate Studies) clarified that it would replace the MA in Sociology, and provide more diversity to students by allowing acquisition of a base of Social Science as a core followed by specialization in any of the areas mentioned by Krug (CLASS). Krug (CLASS) wondered if departments would lose students to Sociology, and Richard Rogers (Department Chair, Psychology) advised that they did not feel students interested in psychology would find the new program more desirable so losing students was not a concern for them, and they would certainly welcome students from the new program into their graduate classes.

Krug (CLASS) then questioned the motivation for the changing of mathematics courses MSED 7530 to 5530/5530G and MSED 7351 to 5531/5531G and whether there was an issue with duplication, as David Stone (COST) had been concerned about previously. Barrs (COST, Chair, Undergraduate Committee) had spoken to Stone (COST) and clarified that the issue of duplication had been resolved and Stone (COST) had withdrawn his earlier objection. The motion for acceptance of the Graduate Curriculum Recommendations was approved.

**4. President's Report**

President Grube reported that our final enrollment census looks like it will come in very close to 15,700, with the newly-entering class at 2871, which brings us up overall in enrollment by about 4 percent. He congratulated Charlie Hardy and the faculty who work the graduate programs for a phenomenal 12 percent growth in graduate enrollment this year. Graduate students now represent about 12 percent (coincidentally) of the entire student body and that is on track with the Strategic Plan to achieve 15 to 20% graduate student population.

Dr. Grube commented on the high quality of the presentations made by faculty who have received various excellence awards and encouraged everyone to make use of these opportunities to hear what those in different areas are involved in.

The ribbon cutting for the two new student residence complexes was held last week, with special guests Vice Chancellor for Facilities Linda Daniel and Regent NeSmith, who chairs the Facilities Committee at the Board of Regents. The event was an excellent opportunity to showcase the campus and illustrate the need for support of additional projects, such as the ongoing enhancement of the Fine Arts facilities. Dr. Grube expressed his appreciation to all of the individuals who enabled this project to be completed in such an efficient manner, particularly Joe Franklin, Auxiliary Services, Vickie Hawkins, who directs Housing on campus, University attorney Lee Davis, and Vice President for Business and Finance Ron Core.

Dr. Grube called attention to the upcoming “Afternoon of the Arts” sponsored by CLASS, and congratulated Mary Hadley on the publication of the novel “Casey’s Revenge” and Mark Edwards for arranging an upcoming seminar by Dr. Wolfgang Ketterly, noting that this continued his tradition of bringing Nobel Prize-winning scientists to our campus.

## **5. Announcements: Vice Presidents**

Provost Vandegrift deferred time to Mary Hazeldine (COBA), who gave an update on the Roles and Rewards Task Force. Data collection and analysis is complete and a draft report prepared, which will be finalized at their next meeting. The campus community can expect to receive that in early November via their web site. Opportunities for discussion of the draft will be provided prior to its finalization, and those discussions will be the basis for completion of their charge, which is recommendation of a model for faculty effort assignment.

The Provost expressed his appreciation to the committee for its work, and moved on to note that the final forum on budget reductions had been held, and the ideas provided will be summarized and made available by next week. Additional suggestions from the campus community can be e-mailed to him or any other vice president. He noted that the suggestions made it clear that a lot of thought had been given to the budget reductions, and he was grateful for the input.

As requested at the last Senate meeting, the Provost’s office expects to have the Level III plans posted to their website within the week.

Cyr (Moderator) called for announcements from other vice presidents. Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Linda Bleicken noted that they have been “taking their show on the road”, and that Georgia Southern recruits quite a few students via these regional visits. Further, they are always interested in bringing high ability students to our campus, and have sponsored *Southern Exposure*, a recruiting event that brought approximately 75 high potential students with SAT scores of 1100 or greater to campus to experience

“University-life”. They will be hosting another of these events in a few weeks, with 80 students lined up, and 12 on the waiting list.

Cyr (Moderator) called for questions for any of the vice presidents. Annette Laing (CLASS) wondered if the August 21<sup>st</sup> memorandum from the Chancellor to the University System Presidents that described the principles to be applied to budget cuts (which was distributed at the various forums) would be made available via the Provost’s web site for faculty and staff who were unable to attend. Provost Vandegrift agreed to do so.

## **6. Report from Marc D. Cyr, Chair, Senate Executive Committee**

Cyr (Moderator, Chair SEC) noted that one information request had been received; it was forwarded to Richard Rogers who will address it during the NCAA report. There were two agenda item requests, both of which were approved. He noted that he would be providing, via the Senate listserv, documents to be considered for inclusion in the Senate orientation packet, and is seeking feedback as to content and form, as well as appropriateness for inclusion. He reminded the Senate that next year’s SEC Chair would be elected at the November 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, and that he needed nominations by November 11<sup>th</sup>, although nominations from the floor at the November Senate meeting would be welcome as well.

## **7. Revised Graduate Faculty Model (to be brought off the table): Graduate Committee Chair Richard Flynn (CLASS):**

Flynn (CLASS) moved that the matter be brought off the table. The motion was seconded and passed. Flynn (CLASS) noted that the proposed document represents a streamlined process for application to the graduate faculty. It removes the need for submitting volumes of material and reduces the application package to departmental recommendation and the applicant’s CV. The new model also provides greater autonomy and flexibility for departments to recommend graduate faculty. The *basic* requirements are: an earned terminal degree, potential for or demonstrated ability to teach graduate courses, potential for or demonstrated involvement in graduate programming and curriculum (including advising and directing student research), and potential for or demonstrated evidence of scholarly activity. The new model removes the Associate Graduate Faculty category, and has two categories of membership: member and affiliate member (for those who might be in private business or not full-time employees of Georgia Southern, etc.) Finally, although one must be a member of the graduate faculty to direct a thesis, the document leaves the assignment of such to the departments. There is a grandfather clause such that all current associate and full graduate members will become members and all current temporary members will become affiliate members. The relatively high number of signatures required stems from accrediting requirements in certain colleges. Flynn (CLASS) moved for acceptance of the document. The motion was seconded and opened for discussion.



Michael Moore (COE) questioned the wording “*allow departments to develop additional criteria for Graduate Faculty, and the Graduate Committee approve these criteria*” on page two of the document, expressing concern that faculty could be excluded from this decision-making process. He also wondered, since the current criteria had, for a long while, been used as a de facto criteria for promotion, if there was potential for that to continue. He speculated that this could become very ‘turf protection’ oriented and also expressed concern regarding who determines the “potential” because it could end up not being faculty-driven at all.

There was discussion between Flynn (CLASS), Moore (COE) and Mark Edwards (COST) that culminated in the clarification that the *Graduate Committee*, which is entirely composed of faculty, and not the *Graduate College* would be approving any additional criteria.

Edwards (COST) asked what would happen in the event of a negative recommendation for Graduate Faculty status (i.e., feedback for someone who is turned down), and Flynn (CLASS) offered that once it was approved at the department level, and after leaving the Dean’s office, the assumption was that the Graduate Committee would essentially serve to rubber stamp it.

There then ensued a lengthy discussion on consistency in the wording of the document, specifically the use of “approved” in some places, and “endorsed” in others, as well as whether an attached flowchart was officially part of the document. Bob Cook (CIT) noted that this ‘on-line’ editing was becoming less than productive and moved to table, which was seconded, and approved by a 20-16 vote. The document was sent back to committee for revision.

#### **7. Revision of Bylaws III.8: SEC Chair Marc Cyr (CLASS)**

Cyr (Moderator) moved to strike the current Section III.8 of the Senate *Bylaws* and replace it with: “The Senate Secretary and the Senate Librarian shall be sitting senators or senators-elect elected by the Senate at its final meeting of the spring semester. The chair of the Senate Executive Committee shall be a sitting senator elected by the senate at the final meeting of the fall semester preceding the beginning of his or her term. These three Senate officers shall serve one-year terms beginning with the first day of the following academic year and may succeed themselves for no more than one additional term (a total of two consecutive years). Persons elected to these positions must have had at least one year of service on the Faculty Senate prior to the start of the term to which they have been elected.” The rationale is as follows:

- The SEC chair votes to break ties, thus he/she should be an elected senator with the senatorial right to vote. The prior language would allowed somebody who was not a senator to be the chair.
- A significant amount of work is done prior to the first full Senate meeting and this allows them to take office sooner.
- For Secretary and Librarian, who are elected in the Spring, if Senate elections are completed by that point in time, these positions could be filled by individuals who have previous Senate experience and are returning for another term.

The motion was seconded.

Krug (CLASS) noted that Cyr (Moderator) appeared to be intending that the individual who will serve as SEC chair have at least one more year remaining when they are elected, but that the wording simply required that they be a sitting Senator at the time of election (i.e., they could be in their 3<sup>rd</sup> year, which would mean they were rotating off next term.) She offered revised wording “The Chair must have at least one year remaining in his or her term on the Senate at the time of election.”

There was additional discussion regarding the wording, with Edwards (COST) proposing “The Chair of the SEC shall be a sitting senator *and* elected by the senate at the final meeting....”. Edwards’s (COST) friendly amendment was seconded and the amended motion was passed.

## **9. Report from Mike Mills, Strategic Planning Council Representative**

Mike Mills (SPC Representative to the Senate) noted that the committee was continuing their meetings with the vice presidents concerning implementation of Level III. Additionally, they have prepared a draft revision to the University’s Mission Statement, which will be released to the campus community October 27<sup>th</sup>. A feedback period will run until November 7<sup>th</sup>, allowing time for a final draft by Thanksgiving. The revised mission statement will be distributed via various venues, and a forum will be held on November 5<sup>th</sup> from 3:30 to 4:30 p.m. (Chemistry/Nursing Building, Room 1002) On-line feedback will be available via a website linked to the Institutional Research web page. He reminded the Senate that the draft was, indeed, a *draft* and they are eager to receive input.

## **10. Report from Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative**

Richard Rogers (NCAA Representative) read the information request received by the SEC and forwarded to him: “Is there currently or has there been in the recent past a University-level committee to study the interest in and feasibility of moving the University’s football program from Division IAA to Division IA? If not, are there any plans to create a committee to evaluate whether or not Georgia Southern can meet the NCAA requirements to participate at the Division IA level, especially the requirements pertaining to minimum average attendance for home games and the minimum number of teams that must be sponsored by the school, and decide whether or not it would be in the University’s best interest to move to Division IA?” Rogers noted that the short answer to all of these questions was “No”, and explained that this was always “on the radar”, but due to new NCAA criteria, it was not considered feasible. Those criteria are:

- Handout at least 90 percent of the 85 football scholarships allotted to major college programs in a given season. (That would be about 76.5 scholarships, we currently give 63 in football.)

- Sponsor a minimum 16 sports overall, including at least six mens' and eight womens' sports. (Currently we have 14 sports: six mens' and eight womens', but we would still need two more sports.)
- Offer at least 200 scholarships or spend at least \$4 million on scholarships in those sports. (We currently have about 164 full-scholarships at a cost of about \$1.55 million.)
- Average no less than 15,000 in actual, not merely paid, home football attendance. (The attendance figures heard over the loud speaker and seen in the paper are paid, but are not, as the current jargon among the inside people is, 'butts in seats'. It is not clear whether 'butts on grass' would count. However, the current seating capacity of Paulson Stadium is 14,400.)
- Play at least five regular season home games vs. IA schools each season. (To entice IA programs to come to Statesboro, to comfortably meet the attendance requirements we would need a bigger stadium. If we add two more sports, we would need facilities to support those sports, the specifics of which would depend on what sports were chosen. Those athletes need locker rooms, uniforms, equipment, and a venue to compete on. So, the current attitude/opinion of the people that do study this issue periodically is that the cost would not worth the benefits.)

Rogers (NCAA Rep) noted that he would be happy to discuss the issue with anyone who wants to talk about it.

## **10. Old Business**

None.

## **11. New Business**

Laing (CLASS) expressed concern that Georgia Southern has signed on to a speaker program organized by the U.S. State Department, called the Global Access Project. We participate with nine other colleges, and the program is run jointly with the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Speakers are brought to each campus and beamed by satellite to all the other campuses. The first speaker's topic was Iraq, and the International Studies Center was concerned that this would be a deeply biased program, even though they were organizing it. They requested that Vernon Egger (History Department) give a speech in advance rebutting the administration's policy in Iraq. She noted that the concern arises from the fact that it appears we have institutionalized through a lecture series a particular perspective, which is different than simply inviting a series of speakers. She further asserted that this was proven clearly by the first speaker in the series, and that the purpose of this series is to defend administration foreign policy. She questioned what we are to benefit from becoming associated with this, particularly as the nine other colleges selected are neither on our peer nor aspiration list: Troy State, Dickinson

State, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, University of Nebraska-Omaha, South Dakota State, etc. It seemed to her and many of her constituents to be embarrassing that we have signed on to a program that is essentially propaganda.

Cyr (Moderator) offered to investigate, which Laing (CLASS) appreciated.

## **12. Announcements from the Floor**

Edwards (COST) announced a Spring semester seminar sponsored by Department of Physics, a distinguished lecture by Dr. Wolfgang Ketterly, from MIT, co-winner of the 2001 Nobel Prize for Physics. Details to follow as they are firmed up.

Phyllis Dallas (CLASS) reminded Senators of the Afternoon of the Arts Event this weekend.

Cyr (Moderator) moved for adjournment. It was seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Jeanette K. Rice, Senate Secretary.

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**November 17, 2003**  
**Russell Union Ballroom**

---

Voting Members in Attendance: (Starla McCollum for Arif Ahmed), (Patricia Humphrey for Sharon Barrs), John Brown, Randy Carlson, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Robert Cook (Robert Costomiris for Phyllis Dallas), Gary Dartt, Elizabeth Downs, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Bob Fernekes, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Clara Krug, Gautam Kundu, Annette Laing, Susie Lanier, Bill Levernier, Jim LoBue, Karl Manrodt, Michael Moore, Patrick Novotny, Laura Regassa, Debra Skinner, David Stone, (Ming Fang He for Deborah Thomas).

Voting Members Absent: Kathy Albertson, David Alley, Reggie Brown, Carol Cornwell, Chris Geyerman, Mary Hadley, Shari Park-Gates (has resigned her seat. Arif Ahmed replaced her until December), Charisse Perkins, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Stuart Tedders, Cordelia Douzenis Zinskie

Senate Officers in Attendance: Marc D. Cyr, Jeanette Rice, Richard Flynn, Jeff McLellan

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Vaughn Vandegrift, Ron Core, Cindi Chance, Charlie Hardy, Fred Whitt, Kate Conway-Turner, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Bede Mitchell, Marilyn Bruce

NCAA Faculty Athletic Rep: Richard Rogers  
SPC Rep: Michael Mills

Visitors: Don Armel, Luther “Trey” Denton, Bob Haney, David Allen, Larry Burton, Denise Battles, Karen McCullogh, Tina Whittle, Clifton Price, June Joyner, Nan LoBue, Ann Crowther

---

**1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 17, 2003, Meeting**

Marc D. Cyr (CLASS, Senate Moderator) moved approval, noting that doing so would also approve bringing the Graduate Model motion off the table. Motion was seconded and approved.

**2. Approval of the [October 16, 2003](#), Minutes**

Jeanette K. Rice (COST, Senate Secretary) moved approval; seconded and approved.

**3. Librarian’s Report of [November 7, 2003](#)**

Richard Flynn (CLASS, Senate Librarian) moved approval and was seconded. Clara Krug (CLASS) requested that someone from the Library committee clarify, on page 6 of the report, the meaning of the phrasing “How High a Goal Is Promoting Transcultural Opportunities? For

collection/development purposes that goal is fairly high in order to insure balance within Library collections.” Bede Mitchell (Dean, Library) provided that the Library’s official collection development policy is annually reviewed in order to make sure that our approval plan, selection policies, all of the efforts that our individual selectors make, take into account the need to build diversity into the collection so that if we are purchasing historical material, for example, it includes post-colonial sensitivities.

There being no further discussion, the Librarian’s report was approved.

**a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair**

Fred Smith (Library), representing Sharon Barrs (COST) requested that the Librarian’s report be modified to note that the undergraduate minutes being approved are from the September 23, 2003 Undergraduate Committee meeting, and requested that Flynn (CLASS, Senate Librarian) make a motion to that effect, and move for approval, which was accommodated.

Cyr (Senate Moderator) clarified that this motion was also to approve the curricular recommendations of the Undergraduate Committee contained in those minutes. The motion was seconded and approved.

**b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair**

Flynn (CLASS) noted that he had nothing to move with regard to the September minutes as the main business would be coming up later in the agenda.

**4. President’s Report**

President Bruce Grube reported final enrollment figures for the fall semester at 15,704, as expected. Spring registration is underway, and running 300-400 students ahead of last year’s spring registration. There is nothing new on the budget front, however, revenue collections were up last month, which is never a bad thing. He reported that the conventional wisdom in Atlanta is that we may finish out the year somewhere between 4 to 5 percent up (the budget was predicated upon a 6.4 percent average, but 4 to 5 is a better than 1, 2 or 0, so it looks good.) It has been confirmed that we will be giving up the 2.5 percent in fiscal ‘04, but we have already accounted for that, so it is nothing the university community will notice. In the works currently, in light of improving economic conditions, is prevention of the 5 percent that is supposed to come out of next year’s budget, and he will keep everyone posted on progress in this area. President Grube reiterated that layoffs for Georgia Southern are absolutely a last recourse, and there are many options available before that would become necessary.

Mark Edwards (COST) wondered if there was any information available regarding the form of the budget reduction plan that the Regents are going to want after the first of the year. President Grube deferred to Ron Core (Vice President, Business and Finance) who provided that budget

hearings with the Board of Regents will occur in late January/early February. We will not know exactly what our budget reduction is going to be until after the legislature meets toward the end of their session, so we will likely not be required to have our formalized plan until April. President Grube reminded everyone that there are several other unresolved factors out there (e.g. potential tuition increase, the separation of fees from the HOPE Scholarships, etc.) all of which have an impact on how this University might organize its budget plan.

David Stone (COST) noted the press coverage about the committee studying budget plans and the possibilities, like the option to separate the fees from tuition, and wondered if the University system has representation on that commission? President Grube confirmed University System of Georgia representation on the task force that has been considering HOPE, but noted that those recommendations will go to the legislature and will have to be adopted by the General Assembly and approved by the Governor. So, while it will be a legislative process, both Chancellor Meredith and one of the campus presidents, Mike Vollmer, who was involved in the initial development of the HOPE program, are providing representation for the University system. Further, Representative Louise McBee has headed up that task force, and Georgia Southern has had direct conversations with her and values her as a friend of higher education.

Stone (COST) questioned the predicted impact of current proposals on enrollment. President Grube speculated that, with respect to the SAT being proposed, which is one of the more controversial ideas whose passage is not guaranteed, if it were adopted at the level it is being proposed it would have literally no affect upon Georgia Southern.

John Brown (COBA) wondered if any additional information was available on the cuts to the Galileo system. President Grube noted the University's concern on this issue, as Galileo is not supported at the System level, and would have a significant impact on the University's budget should we try to sustain the services provided. He ceded to Dean Mitchell who added that Chancellor Meredith and the Board of Regents have put in their own budget request that the state include full funding for Galileo. The concern is that Galileo is largely supported by lottery funds which are also trying to support HOPE. Nonetheless, the request is that the legislature find ways to fully fund it.

Annette Laing (CLASS) asked Dean Mitchell if, among the databases that are being cut, there were any online journals that are no longer accessible to the faculty, not just current and future issues, but also past issues, and if not, was that a possibility. Dean Mitchell felt that if Galileo has to sustain further cuts, what will likely be looked at first will be the more specialized databases, however, our position is that this is too important to cut, but the cuts will be made if they have to be. Laing (CLASS) wondered if the Library would revisit whether we ought to be going to electronic journals. Dean Mitchell clarified that we take electronic journals wherever possible, but that an electronic journal is not necessarily a savings over a print journal

## **5. Report from Marc D. Cyr, Chair, Senate Executive Committee**

Cyr (Moderator) noted that in addition to items reported in the SEC minutes for 11-6-03, he had secured information on the Global Access Project (GAP), recalling that Georgia Southern's participation in the program was questioned by Laing (CLASS) at the October senate meeting. He provided the following summary, obtained from Nancy Shumaker (Director, Center for International Studies) and Vernon Eggers (CLASS):

The Global Access Project is co-sponsored the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the Department of State (DOS). The campus was informed of the program at the beginning of the year. Presidents of AASCU schools nominated their institutions for inclusion in the GAP program and currently there are 12 schools involved. The program details were worked out by representatives of those schools, AASCU, and the DOS. Among the goals are to raise international awareness on campuses and to encourage students on the AASCU campuses to consider careers in foreign affairs and diplomacy. Because GAP schools recognized the DOS officials come with certain points of view, differing points of view will be offered via roundtable discussions, symposia, and presentations. The intent is to provide a well-rounded view of the topic or issue of the month. For example, the November 18<sup>th</sup> edition will have a roundtable discussion, and Vernon Eggers' involvement in the previous edition was not to provide a rebuttal, but a rounded, unbiased framework for the current situation in Iraq, so that students could form their own opinions regarding the DOS presentation from an informed position. Eggers largely confirms this version of the setup, that he told International Studies that he would be critical of the federal administration's handling of Iraq, and that this was welcomed for the alternative perspectives it would offer. He figures GAP was likely intended by the DOS as a propaganda effort, but that it has been turned into a fruitful venue for discussion and learning.

Cyr (Moderator) noted that Shumaker (Director, Center for International Studies) has volunteered to come to Senate and answer questions should the Senate wish it.

## **6. Election of Senate Moderator**

Edwards (COST) moved to nominate Jeanette Rice (COST, Senate Secretary) for the post of Faculty Senate Moderator; motion was seconded. Cyr (Moderator) called for additional nominations from the floor; there were none. Edwards' motion was approved.

## **7. Motion to bring off the table the Revised Graduate Faculty Model**

Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) pointed out changes made to the Graduate Faculty Model, specifically that additional criteria and initial nomination materials, etc., will come from faculty committees within departments, schools, and colleges, and that the committee had voted to not include the flowchart as part of the document. He moved that the revised model be accepted.



Gautam Kundu (CLASS) called attention to the wording, in the second sentence, “creative scholar or creative performer in his/her discipline,” and wondered what kind of scholarship was being addressed, i.e., did it refer to being innovative? Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) clarified that in some departments, scholarship takes the form of performance, set design, etc., which is why the word ‘creative’ was included. Kundu (CLASS) noted that lack of wording concerning emeritus and wondered if they are eligible for dissertation committees? Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) said emeritus faculty could, if nothing else, serve on a committee as an affiliate member, as that category was meant to recognize outstanding scholars and those who are not full-time employees of Georgia Southern University.

Michael Moore (COE) was still concerned about different criteria from department to department and requested assessment after a year to see how departmental criteria were working out. Cyr (Moderator) noted as a point of procedure that if the Senate Graduate Committee is looking at and approving these criteria then that is an ongoing review process and problems can be brought to the attention of the Senate at any time. Moore (COE) wondered if there would be publication of college and department criteria, or how that would be accessed. Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) offered the clarification that if a department should wish to establish criteria not included in the revised Graduate Faculty Model, those criteria would have to originate from a faculty committee, and come to the Graduate Committee for its approval at which time those criteria would undoubtedly find their way into the Senate Librarian’s Report, and since actions of the Graduate Committee have to be approved separately, those criteria ultimately would have to be approved by the full Faculty Senate.

Ming Fang He (COE) called attention to Item 3, ‘potential for directing student research’ and requested the wording be changed to ‘directing graduate program research’ to avoid confusion with undergraduate students. Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) argued that graduate research is implied from the primary clause, which is demonstrated involvement in graduate programming, in curriculum, including advising and directing student research, and to his reading, did not imply anything but graduate research. Further discussion yielded that the fact that it was a Graduate Faculty model pretty much covered it.

He (COE) followed up Moore’s (COE) question regarding criteria, i.e., what is demonstrated ability, what is demonstrated involvement, how the criteria are kept consistent across the campus. Laing (CLASS) reminded the Senate that this document had been provided to faculty well in advance of this meeting, and confirmed with Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) that no questions or concerns were raised to him prior to the meeting. Based on the large number of faculty who are waiting on this document to be passed, she urged the Senate to support it, trusting that any problems that develop can be revisited in the future.

Stone (COST) queried where non-tenure track faculty would be included in this document. He noted that there are individuals across campus that have degrees and teach graduate courses, and the grandfather clause would seem to include them as affiliate members, however the list in the document does not seem to accommodate such. Edwards (COST) pointed out that the document

says ‘affiliate’ can be used to recognize outstanding scholars including, but not limited to, and then goes on to name possible categories, so faculty members in that category could be affiliate members. Charlie Hardy (Dean, College of Graduate Studies) agreed that it seemed to cover it, but noted on the final page the clause that says requests for exceptions to the policies and procedures must be submitted to the Chair of the Graduate Committee and Dean, providing the necessary door for these faculty. Edwards (COST) moved to call the question; the revised graduate faculty model was approved.

**7. Motion re: Welfare Committee proposals re: “Shared Governance: Principles and Guidelines”**

Jean-Paul Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) moved for approval of the document written by the Faculty Welfare Committee regarding Shared Governance, adding that nine recommendations from the Task Force on Shared Governance were received by the Faculty Welfare Committee last year, who felt a framework was needed to move those documents for approval as the principles of Shared Governance at Georgia Southern were unclear. The committee looked at other institutions and found that in some cases it was with the Senate, and sometimes it was much more than the Senate, and thus they attempted to draw a few introductory principles. In essence, the Introduction, Scope and Item #1 under Method were written up by the Welfare Committee and the remainder is very similar to the recommendations submitted by the Task Force. Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) read the motion:

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee wishes to move that the following be approved by the Senate: 1) A document entitled, “Shared Governance, Principles and Guidelines,” which was attached and posted on the web site, 2) inclusion of the document entitled, “Shared Governance, Principles and Guidelines,” in the Faculty Handbook, as Section 108-1 along with the renaming of Section 108 as “Shared Governance,” thus 108-2 would be entitled, “Faculty Senate.”

Cyr (Moderator) suggested a two motion format, moving forward with the first part, and then a second motion regarding inclusion in the Handbook. Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) moved for approval of the document entitled “Shared Governance, Principles and Guidelines”; seconded. Edwards (COST) questioned if Faculty Senate approval of a document or a statement was just a statement of support that appears in the minutes? Cyr (Moderator) provided that if the secondary part of the motion is the inclusion of this in an official publication, then we need to have the language and the principle of that document approved. Krug (CLASS) commented that this is continuing work that a task force was asked to do by the Senate Executive Committee in November 2001, and it is continued by the Faculty Welfare Committee, which is a committee of the Faculty Senate at Georgia Southern University, so this is very closely related to Senate work. The task force document Jean-Paul mentioned is the method, and what the Faculty Welfare Committee has apparently done is to enhance what the task force, which had a representative from every unit at the University, presented and it was accepted and sent to the Committee for them to do just this.

Randy Carlson (COE) asked if, from the wording of this document, it was safe to infer that every time we want to do something, a committee has to be formed and the faculty have to elect members of a committee? Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) responded that the areas are limited to numbers one through six, reminded the Senate that this is a first step, and when the nine items were submitted to the committee they did not know how to approach faculty governance, what it meant, to what level and to which areas it applied. The committee endeavored to set up the framework.

Carlson (COE) clarified that his concerns go to seeing the word “all” in a policy statement, and if that might not end up being problematic, fearing the day-to-day practice may be difficult to work with given a strict interpretation of what is written down. Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) felt that particular wording came directly from the Task Force. Krug (CLASS) noted that the task force Jean-Paul referred to is the Senate Task Force on the Role of the Faculty in Shared Governance, and the results of a survey that was conducted among all faculty in the various colleges led to the framing of nine original items, but that the six items in the current document really include what the Task Force recommended based on faculty response. The reason this was included was because of responses indicating that there were faculty who wanted to have elected committees for various kinds of decisions, because this was not happening in their units.

Rice (COST) noted that this was not to imply that any decision that would normally be under the purview of the President or the Provost without faculty input would now be open to faculty input. Krug (CLASS) mentioned that faculty wanted to have committees that are already existing in their department or their college elected rather than appointed. There are assumptions that policies are in writing in regard to annual review, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. However, in some units faculty indicated that they do not know if they are in writing or that they may not be in writing, so it was recommended that the policies be determined to be in writing and that faculty have access to them, so that they may better prepare for their applications for these various personnel divisions that are directly related to their livelihood.

John Brown (COBA) supported the document, saying that it speaks to the kind of culture we are trying to build at Georgia Southern University, a culture that President Grube has helped promote by putting a Moderator in front of the Senate instead of the President. He is not in favor of being too descriptive in the sorts of things the Senate does, because none of the culture is going to work without good faith on the part of all parties. He asserted that this document establishes a common framework that we can all agree with and live with, and urged the Senate to support it.

Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) understood concern over the word “all”, but called attention to Item #2, “All policies regarding faculty must be in writing.” In that instance, all is appropriate because not one member of the committee could cite an example of a policy regarding faculty that should not be in writing.

There being no other discussion, the document was voted on and approved. Cyr (Moderator) moved to the second motion, the inclusion in the Faculty Handbook of the document as Section 108.1, along with renaming of Section 108 as Shared Governance, thus 108.2 would be entitled Faculty Senate, and so forth. The motion was seconded. Edwards (COST) sought confirmation that approving this motion was, in essence, requesting permission from the President to include the document in the Faculty Handbook. Cyr (Moderator) offered that every motion that is passed by the Senate is passed on to the President for approval. If he approves it, we get a written letter saying so. If he disapproves it, we get a written letter explaining why within thirty days. Cyr (Moderator) called for a vote and the motion carried.

## **9. Report from Mike Mills, SPC Representative**

Mills (CLASS, SPC Representative) reported that since the last Senate meeting, the Strategic Planning Council welcomed two new members: Senator John Brown from COBA, newly elected faculty representative, and Gabriel Smith was appointed by the Student Government to be the SPC's undergraduate student representative. Since the last Senate meeting, virtually all the SPC's efforts have been directed toward producing a draft revision of the University's Mission Statement to make it more in line with the Strategic Plan and the priorities and aspirations of the University. On November 5, 2003, the SPC held an open forum to gather suggestions and revisions to the statement, and on November 12<sup>th</sup> the SPC incorporated that input along with numerous thoughtful and extremely helpful suggestions received online. After a fruitful session, the committee put out a second draft of the University Mission Statement, and is now in the process of collecting comment on the revised statement. The deadline for input on this second revision for the mission statement will be this Saturday, November 22, 2003. As always comments can be made online to the Institutional Research office, at [iroffice@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:iroffice@georgiasouthern.edu), and to any member of the Strategic Planning Council. He encourage Senators and their constituents who have not done so to provide input. He then recognized Trey Denton (Chair, SPC) to outline a new annual process for revising and updating the University's Strategic Plan.

Denton (COBA, Chair, SPC) thanked the Faculty Senate for its support of our strategic planning efforts over the years, as well as the SPC members in attendance (John Brown, Mike Mills, Charlie Hardy, Bob Haney). He noted that for the strategic planning process to be successful, there needs to be a mechanism for regular review and modification. While many of the Level III plans were completed this current academic year, Level I is now three-and-a-half years old. Additionally, Level I and Level II plans were both completed before this era of persistent budget issues and reductions. The SPC proposed to the President's Cabinet that we needed a regular process that would enable us to update our plans on an annual basis, with the hope of increasing their relevance and effectiveness, and minimizing the work associated with the process. He noted that this was to be more of a 'tweaking' than a rewriting. The SPC developed an annual time line for completing these revisions and it was approved by the President's Cabinet in September: annually beginning in January and extending for four months, the SPC will engage the entire campus in a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analysis. SPC will

meet with all members of the campus family and engage them in this discussion. Based on the feedback they will formulate a revision to the Level I plan and send it to the President's Cabinet in draft form, who will share it with the entire campus, and ask for feedback. They will then make final revisions and share that approved document with all university areas. In late summer/early fall semester, the President will meet with the SPC to discuss the new Level I plan and any important new strategic initiatives for the coming academic year. During that time and immediately following the meeting with the President, the SPC will meet individually with each Vice President and the Provost to review activities under their control in the preceding year related to the Strategic Plan, and discuss new strategic initiatives for the coming year. The Provost and the Vice Presidents will then guide a revision of the Level II Plans, which are University-wide implementation plans. In the final phase, which will take place during the fall semester, the Provost and the Vice Presidents will guide revisions and updates to the Level III Plans. These dates are meant to be guidelines that the campus can anticipate to use.

Laing (CLASS) wondered how one plans when the funds keep changing and if there was a 'basic plan' that can be tweaked as the budget rises and falls. Denton (Chair, SPC) provided that Level I is the relatively static plan, which annual tweaking would not change. Laing (CLASS) then queried if she was correct in assuming, based on the changes to the Mission Statement, that we were no longer a 'teaching-first' institution? Denton (Chair, SPC) felt that we absolutely were, and that a primary goal the SPC kept in mind when revising the mission statement was preservation of that emphasis, as noted in the second paragraph where it is clearly stated that teaching is our primary mission. It was the language "teaching first" that SPC found problematic, citing many faculty who took issue with that particular phrase. Thus, it was removed, with the hope that SPC preserved the intent. Laing (CLASS) questioned if she was correctly reading that we then expect faculty to be publishing scholars to inform our teaching, which Denton (Chair, SPC) confirmed. Laing (CLASS) then brought up the inconsistency of teaching as a priority and a means of ensuring a good education with the fact that temporary faculty in Liberal Arts are expected to teach five classes instead of four, and whether that was happening across campus. Cyr (Moderator) noted that we had moved outside the purview of the SPC, and suggested the issue be brought up under new business.

Cyr (Moderator) asked if the SPC would be involved in budget issues when talking to the Vice Presidents and was advised by Denton (Chair, SPC) that that relationship was still evolving but would center on whether budget reductions were consistent with the Strategic Plan. President Grube reminded the Senate of the email that went to the campus on budget, which included the sentence "plans will be developed within the divisions with review by the SPC for adherence to the Strategic Plan."

Laura Regassa (COST) inquired if it was possible that, with the ongoing revision of the Strategic Plan, a unit previously recommended for enhancement may no longer be. Denton (Chair, SPC) opined that areas of emphasis across campus may change because of the evolving environment in which we operate. However, program review will not be tweaked on an annual basis, it will take place on a cyclical basis, determined by the Board of Regents to be every 7 years.

## **10. Report from Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative**

Richard Rogers (NCAA Representative) distributed a portion of his report covering the description of the responsibilities of the University Athletic Committee in the Faculty Handbook, include the requirement of a written report to the Faculty Senate on all NCAA infractions. In the past that has been accomplished by just appending the report to the Athletic Committee minutes. Since the minutes of that committee are now posted on the website, he was reluctant to continue with that method, as he believed the Senate would agree how minor and secondary they are, but to a naive media reporter or to an unscrupulous recruiter from another institution they could receive a lot of unwarranted and unjustified attention. To avoid this, the paper copy was provided. All of the infractions are self-reported, and compared to data on the number of reports for all the institutions in the Southern Conference, we were rather high but not at the top. Compliance and the athletic staff are very diligent about looking for infractions and very conscientious reporting them. He advised he'd be happy to take questions.

A second document was provided to the Senate concerning a \$5,000 post-graduate scholarship provided by TIAA-CREF to a Southern Conference student-athlete, which is accompanied by \$1,000 to the faculty member of that awardee's choice. Last year the winner was a soccer player from Davidson named Soren Johnson. The document handed out was a copy of his letter. With all of the negative press that collegiate athletics has received recently, Rogers (NCAA Rep) thought the middle paragraph of this letter might provide a little different perspective on the benefits and values of an intercollegiate competition. Lastly, he reported that one of our men's soccer players, Tony Moffat, a senior Business major with a 3.05 GPA, was selected as the Southern Conference Player of the Year.

## **11. Old Business**

None.

## **12. New Business**

Laing (CLASS) returned to her concern about temporary faculty in CLASS teaching five courses instead of four, and whether temporary faculty in other colleges were also being required to do so.

Provost Vaughn Vandegrift responded that there are faculty in various places around the University that do teach 15 hour loads, providing examples from the College of Health and Human Sciences, COST and the College of Education. Laing (CLASS) mused that, despite the grand claims from the Mission Statement, we are actually creating a two-tier faculty and noted that would present an unappealing profile to potential full-time faculty members particularly when combined with a heavy teaching load, extra service expectations because of fewer tenure-track positions, no sabbaticals and a location in rural South Georgia.

Provost Vandegrift commented that the question about 15-hour loads for temporary faculty arises because regular tenure and tenure-track faculty's 12-hour teaching load does not include the equivalent of additional three-hours for service and scholarship. Laing (CLASS) countered that the problem with that is that temporary faculty, in order to be effective according to our own documents, would have to be doing research; we are saying that research is being done in order to inform our teaching. Provost Vandegrift stated that the point was that in situations where the load assignment is 15-hours teaching or 12-hours and some other assignments, those loads are appropriately determined at the department and college level to make an approximation of equitable in terms of load assignments among full-time, tenured, and tenure-track faculty as contrasted with the temporary faculty. He cited the 1998 memo from Acting Provost Dr. Bleicken outlining that the 15-hour load is essentially a 12-hour teaching load and the remaining three hours is taken up with other responsibilities, which, in the case of tenured and tenure-track faculty is scholarship and service. In the case of temporary faculty, the extent they engage in such is determined by the department and the dean. It may take up some or all of those three-hours, but to the extent it does not they may be assigned other teaching responsibilities.

Cyr (Moderator) noted that the Mission Statement states that for good teaching, scholarship is necessary, but we have people who are teaching for whom scholarship is not deemed necessary. Laing (CLASS) added that those individuals are being exploited, which is ironic when we talk of faculty, staff and students embracing core values expressed through integrity, civility, kindness, collaboration, etc. Bob Cook (CIT) added that the issue that the faculty need to be concerned about is whether department chairs or administrators are creating these 'teaching only' faculty and not providing them with the support and guidance of the tenured and tenure-track faculty that they need to do a quality job.

Michael Moore (COE) expressed concern for students in classes with teachers who are teaching five courses, and that the ultimate concern is shortchanging the education of a student. Edwards (COST) wondered what the impact of this would be on SACS' accreditation? Provost Vandegrift did not believe it has any effect on our SACS' accreditation, as SACS does not limit class size or the number of teaching hours that are appropriate to a load, or instruct the university on how to interpret a full load. He added that Georgia Southern has avoided a two-tiered kind of faculty structure. Nationally, about 25 to 30% of courses at universities are taught by adjuncts or part-time faculty. At Georgia Southern it is only about 5%, because we roll the needs for part-time teaching together to create full-time, benefitted positions for temporaries, at increased cost to the university, based on the belief that it is appropriate to provide opportunities for career advancement by working full-time at a university in a salaried, benefitted position whose load is interpreted by the Deans and the departments. In the case raised today the Dean has agreed to meet with the faculty that are at issue. Provost Vandegrift reported that he was perfectly agreed to let that process work.

Krug (CLASS) inquired if there will be a faculty/staff directory this year. Vice President Core noted it will be online to save printing costs. Provost Vandegrift corrected that they had decided to print it this year and it would be out in a week or so.

**13. Announcements: Vice Presidents**

Provost Vandegrift deferred to Mary Hazeldine (COBA) for an update on the Roles and Rewards Task Force. She reported that the task force recently made available on their web site a draft report that summarizes the results of data collection efforts, and encouraged all faculty to review the material and provide feedback. She noted two upcoming forums at which the draft document will be discussed: Wednesday, November 19, from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. in the CIT auditorium, which is the Provost's open forum at which the task force will have a discussion, and November 20<sup>th</sup> from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. in COBA, Room 1124 to discuss the draft document. The web site includes an electronic feedback form. The draft document will facilitate a campus-wide discussion regarding Faculty Roles and Rewards, which will assist in studying and recommending a model or models for faculty effort assignment.

Provost Vandegrift noted that the report that is on the web contains self-reported data, and that the temporary faculty self-report that they do not work as many hours a week as the tenured and tenure-track faculty, adding that he provided that information with the hope that it will provoke everyone to read the report. Moving on, he announced that at the general faculty meeting J. B. Claiborne, Professor of Biology, was recognized as the Eidson Presidential Award Winner for General Excellence over a sustained career for achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service. Dr. Claiborne has been at Georgia Southern University for some twenty years, and he received a plaque and a check for \$5,000 for his accomplishments.

**14. Announcements from the Floor**

None.

**15. Adjournment**

Cyr (Moderator) moved for adjournment. It was seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Jeanette K. Rice, Senate Secretary.